

THE
CRIES OF THE PEOPLE:
ADDRESSED
TO THE KING, THE MINISTRY,
THE
MARSHALS, THE PEERS, THE REPRESENTATIVES, THE MAGISTRATES,
AND THE
French Nation.

BY ALEXANDER CREVEL,

AUTHOR OF A PHILOSOPHIC ESSAY ON THE IMPORTANT ART OF GOVERNING A STATE, OF THE MEDICINE POLITIQUE, AND OF AN ADDRESS TO THE CHAMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES UPON THE LEGISLATIVE POWER, ETC ETC.

Claudite jam rivos,
Sat prata biberunt.

VIRGILE.

Je vois avec regret la France desolee,
A nos dissentions la nature immolee,
Sur nos communs debris, l'Anglais trop eleve,
Menagant cet etat par nous-memes cherve.

VOLTAIRE, *Adelaide Duguesclin*

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL

LONDON :

PUBLISHED BY J. BUMPUS, No. 6, LOWER HOLBORN;

SOLD BY

SHERWOOD, NEELY, AND JONES, PATERNOSTER ROW; J. BLACKLOCK, ROYAL EXCHANGE; C. CHAPPELL, PALL MALL; W. SHARPE, KING STREET;
AND ALL BOOKSELLERS

1818.

PREFACE.

AT a period when the French have just regained the liberty of the press ; at a period when the withdrawing of the Allies from the French territory is confidently spoken of, it cannot, I presume, be judged idle to take a cursory review of the consequences likely to result to France and to Europe from these events.

What has *already* ensued from the first of these measures, may in a great degree serve us as a guide to what will *probably* ensue from the latter. I shall therefore dismiss my readers as soon as possible to the perusal of M. Crevel's work ; particularly as it is not my wish to weary them with a tedious digression on what is as plain as the light of day.

If the first use that was made of the liberty of the press, has been to let loose a swarm of inflammatory and abusive publications against the government ; if the old revolutionary watch-word of *the rights of*

the people has again been sent forth under a thousand different forms ; may we not suppose that the arm is as ready to brandish the sword, as the tongue to spit forth its venom, the instant it finds itself freed from a wholesome and salutary restraint. That restraint I have no hesitation in saying will exist no longer than does the presence of the allied armies. Order, loyalty, and real liberty will evacuate France with their rear guard ; leaving in their stead, confusion, anarchy, and usurped authority on the part of factious demagogues, of the rights of the crown, and the true interests of the people.

There is perhaps another circumstance or two that will make this pamphlet interesting to an English reader. It is unquestionably written by a man of no ordinary talent, and it breathes unqualified hatred to our country, our government, and our national prosperity.

But as there is no poison, however destructive, from which the skill of modern pharmacy has not found the art of extracting some useful particles ; so perhaps may we, even in the deadly henbane in which M. Crevel has dipped his pen, whenever his subject leads him to speak of England, discern some salutary hint towards averting the smallest of those misfortunes, with the whole weight of which he would rejoice to see us saddled.

M. Crevel has indulged so much in poetic quotation, that I feel inclined to follow his example, and

to quote a solitary passage ; for which, however, I am not indebted to his *favourite* Voltaire.

“ Il est tems d’ enchaîner cette hydre révoltée,
 “ D’ étouffer les clamours de sa bouche infectée,
 “ Declairer de ses pas les détours tortueux,
 “ Et de faire tomber son masque fastueux.”

“ 'Tis time to chain this rebel hydra down,
 “ To stop th' infectious uproar of his mouth,
 “ To show the wily cunning of his track,
 “ And to unstrip him of his specious mask.”

I mentioned before that the language of M. Crevel breathes unqualified hatred to this happy country ; and those, therefore, of our countrymen who are dissatisfied with their own government, need not on that account expect to be treated with any mercy by him.

Par exemple, let us take the following specimen of his sentiments on the English Opposition :

“ The members of the English Opposition are not the real friends of the nation ; *but impudent caballers, machines, in short, which the minister can move by the attraction of guineas and places.*”

I much incline to think M. Crevel has drawn his opinion of the English constitution from rather a prejudiced source ; and should he again do us the favour of paying such *marked attention* to our institutions, as he has done in the following pamphlet, I take the liberty of giving him a trifling piece of

advice. In other words, I refer him, for the better understanding his subject, to the celebrated pages of one of his own countrymen*, in preference to the writings of Hone and Cobbett, or the harangues of Orator Hunt.

He will then find how admirably the genius of our constitution is adapted to that of the people ; he will perceive that rational Liberty has established her *palladium* on our sea-girt isle ; he will be assured, that if some *partial difficulties* have existed amongst us, he has been strangely misinformed as to their nature and extent ; he will ultimately learn, that if our government is not entirely free from errors (and where is the human one that is so?), it is at least peculiarly fitted to *English habits and English hearts* ; to those habits that have enabled us patiently to devote a large portion of the produce of our industry to the support of a just war ; to those hearts that have swelled with honourable pride on the banks of the Seine, and in the plains of Waterloo.

Whatever M. Crevel may think of the political differences of our countrymen on some points of minor consideration, I believe I can venture to tell him, that on the most important one of all we are *unanimous* ; that we shall leave him in quiet possession of his fine logic, his darling *la Patrie*, his *Dieu** *la Patrie et le Roi!* that on this side the

* De L'Ohme.

water, we consider the interest of our mild and *constitutional* monarchs, as inseparably interwoven with the interests of the nation ; that the House of Brunswick not only reigns over our persons, but in our hearts ; and that if he and his associates ever dare to set hostile foot on our shores, he will perhaps find some little difficulty in digesting our *national motto*, “ *St. George and England.*”

Au reste : “ the country’s in little ultimate danger, “ when the beggar’s as ready to fight for his dish, as “ the laird for his land.” Let M. Crevel* write away : we are ready to acknowledge him a very *clever*, as well as a very *impudent* fellow ; but the little quill of the fretful porcupine will not for a moment interrupt the repose of the stately lioness.

Since these few remarks were written, the public mind has been considerably agitated by the atrocious attempt to assassinate the Duke of Wellington. The uncertainty in which that event is at present involved, has served as an additional cause to keep alive the interest which every one must take in the discovery of the *instigators* of a plan as truly diabolical, and so unworthy of a nation that pretends to high and chivalric notions of honour. I am far from wishing to stab the reputation of any man, or of any

* It may not be useless to the English reader to be informed, that M. Crevel for some time occupied the situation of Private Secretary to the celebrated Prince Talleyrand.

party, but I cannot refrain from calling the attention of my readers to p. 92 and 93, of M. Crevel's pamphlet. It will be seen, that he here studiously endeavours to hold up, as a mark for popular odium, the illustrious personage who is the glory of *our country*, and who, under Providence, has been the means of stemming the inordinate ambition of *our neighbours*. I repeat, that without directly imputing to M. Crevel dishonourable or *insidious* motives, he must, at least, be said to have used all diligence in setting forth the Duke of Wellington, under an appellation that was certain of provoking the jealousy, and irritating the passions, of so vain a nation as the French. Let us judge him by one of his own expressions.

“ France recognises no authority but that of her king; *she refuses to bend her neck under the yoke of a proconsul.*”

THE
CRIES OF THE PEOPLE.

LIBERTY OF THE PRESS.

THE PRIVILGES AND DUTY OF A POLITICAL WRITER.

A REPRESENTATIVE system badly conceived, and badly put together, is an unceasing obstacle to establishing a constitutional government, and realising the view of the citizens, a view cherished by reason and good sense.

What errors and sophisms do we not detect in the writings, the parliamentary and judicial proceedings, on the extension of the liberties of the people, the duties and the rights of the government, the rights and the duties of the governed.

To lay hold on the just equilibrium is the most important point, for in proportion as the sovereign or people lose their rights, monarchy or democracy augment their strength.

Political prejudices are destructive shoots, which imbibe that nutritious juice, without which the tree of liberty cannot elevate its majestic trunk.

One of the principal foundations of the representative system, is the right of publishing one's sentiments. The extension and the restriction of this liberty, of this right, are become subjects of discussion. The citizens are beheld moving in the vast arena, opened by prejudices, the children of passion and

of error; but a profound study of the science of politics enables the observer easily to follow a sure guide. All liberty is capable of being limited; in receiving too great an extension, it degenerates into licentiousness and abuse. Licentiousness is a foe to social order. When the passions are roused, the public security is troubled. Public security is the safeguard of a polished society, and therefore liberty has its limits.

Liberty terminates where licence begins. How establish this transition, this line of demarkation, on immaterial reasonings, which offer no check to the sallies of an imagination more or less exalted, according to the impression which it receives from want of reflection, from prejudice, and from error? Here is the gordian knot: in cutting it you abandon the examination of its texture; the endeavour to unravel it is more conformable to analysis. Analysis is the path that conducts to synthesis. If you know the entire organization of its parts, the re-union of these parts becomes easier.

When a nation has shaken off the yoke of an absolute monarchy, it becomes one of the inalienable privileges of the citizens, to have the right of publishing their opinions; but the monarchy, in being divested of unlawful power, perceives the bounds of its legitimate authority in the circle traced by the institutions of the state, and in the national representation.

Under the sway of justice, the ægis of sound liberty, every citizen enjoys his rights, provided he does not direct them as dangerous weapons against the public security, and the general interest of society. When liberty makes an attack on the common security and the common interest, she has passed her bounds, and degenerates into licentiousness. Every species of liberty that in separating itself from the object of political institutions has become unlicensed, is reprehensible. In repressing license, it is deprived of its excess of liberty. It follows, that

every work which does not invade public security and the common interest, is liable to no interruption.

This position granted, what measures must we employ, to restrain the flights of imagination, and to destroy the fatal effects that would result from the application of false interpretations, when ignorance draws insidious results from the erroneous principles which she calls in?

To obviate these weighty inconveniences, it is indispensable to identify oneself with the nature and spirit of the real representative system; we shall otherwise march without compass in a vast desert, where the eye can rest itself on no fixed point.

To kindle the flame of rebellion, to excite divisions, to preach up insubordination and disobedience to the government, is to oppose the preservation of tranquillity and the common interest. Guilt attaches to the writer who proposes this end.

Is it permitted to criticise the acts of government, the policy of the king, of the ministry, of the executive power? Can we distinguish the acts of the sovereign from the acts of his government? How are we to solve questions so important and so delicate? Let us not stray from this fundamental principle—*Governments are founded on the interests of the people, and not on the interests of the sovereign.* Every institution has an object. The object of the institution of a government is the good of all, the interest of all, the prosperity of the nation.

When a government fulfils the object of its institution, the governed have a right to state their opinions, on the means capable of contributing to the common felicity.

On the contrary, when the government has not attained the desired end, the citizens again enjoy their privileges and dis-

charge their duty, in pointing out to this very government, the track which it ought to pursue to arrive at it.

To reason from consequences, and to prove the purity of his intentions, can a writer dispense with *stating the motives* of his opinions? No; but to state the motives by pointing out the way which appears to him the most natural and direct, it is indispensable that he should establish a point of comparison. He has so far run over the beaten track, in order to shew the dangers with which it is beset at each step. How can he point out these dangers without examining, discussing, blaming, scrutinising the acts of government which engender them? He will act rationally, then, in first discovering the evil, in order to apply a remedy to that evil.

When a whole people are distressed, the common misery rebounds on each citizen. To recognise as a principle, that blaming the acts of government and those of the monarch, is weakening the respect due to the head of the state, would imply a wish to overthrow the edifice of the liberties of the people. This principle would, indeed, become an undeniably one, if it was proved that monarchs derive from their birth *superior intelligence*, that they are *infallible*, that they are able to govern *themselves*, that they can *see* every thing, *comprehend* every thing, and *know* every thing. The annals of nations, the records of history, declare, that there have existed, and demonstrate that there will always exist, unenlightened and ignorant monarchs, susceptible of being led away by crooked inclinations, perfidious councils, and the impulse of the passions.

When a nation is ruled by an enlightened and virtuous monarch, political writings become still necessary. The sovereign, secluded in his palace, withdrawn from his subjects, is not always aware of what the obscure individual, lost in the crowd, becomes acquainted with, by the points of contact

which unite him to all the classes of society; truth does not approach the throne till after having long suffered under the blows which private interests and passions bestow on her. Her features are often so altered, that it is difficult to recognise her.

A Chinese Emperor once reprimanded and threatened the historian of the empire. "What," says he, "have you the audacity daily to write down, and to note my faults?" "I do my duty," replied the man of letters, "and I will fulfil my obligation in marking *this day your complaints and your menaces.*" The emperor blushed and repented, saying, "Well! write it all: I will endeavour to do nothing that posterity "may reproach me with." I propose this Chinese prince as a model to our European sovereigns.

If the citizens were *obliged* to imitate servilely the dangerous example of courts, they would, in the necessity for disguising their sentiments, be deprived of their rights; the upright man would lay down his pen. The right of publishing one's sentiments, through the agency of the press, implies the privilege of writing *boldly* and *freely*, in extending this property, this liberty, to the point where license commences. But to write *boldly* and *freely*, truths must be stated, however severe they may appear.

The conscientious writer fulfils his duty in endeavouring to apply a remedy to the evils which afflict his country. As in first principles, one cannot remove effects without destroying their causes, we must ascend then to the source of the evil, and make ourselves acquainted with the cause, in order to apply an effectual remedy, which, in destroying the cause, may annihilate its effect.

If this cause is met with in *abuses* and *prejudices*, in the *faults of administration*, and the *errors of government*, will the political physician disdain to mark them out? No; for he

would be without possibility of discussing the method of recovery: he could not proceed from consequence to consequence; his dissertations would merit no attention; his reasonings would be false.*

Monarchs not being infallible by their personal condition, necessarily fall into involuntary mistakes and errors, the result of the vicious instructions which they receive. To throw light on these, is a duty which every citizen, who is a friend to honesty, ought to hasten to fulfil, by submitting his reflections to his fellow citizens, his natural judges: but to enlighten sovereigns, the writer will reason upon, will scrutinise their acts by the aid of liberty, unmixed with licentiousness. Let us not be confounding *boldness* with *insolence*, truth with libel: distinctions most important to establish, when it may suit the purpose of some to confound them.

Is a writer licentious and libellous in saying to the sovereign,—

“ Sire, vous permettrez qu'un *ami* véritable,
 “ (Je hasarde ce nom, si rare aupres des rois),
 “ *Libre en ses sentiments*, s'ouvre a vous quelquefois, †
 “ Sire, will you sometimes grant a real *friend*,
 “ (The name I hazard, tho' so rare near kings)
 “ With manly freedom should approach your ear.”

* The agents of supreme controul always make it a sort of duty to aggrandise and to extend the power of their master, and hope by this means to establish their own authority. *This excess of devotion* unceasingly threatens the rights of a nation. What is the method of containing it within the limits that the law has prescribed? There is but one way; it is prompt: it is efficacious; it is the liberty of the press, which at once forewarns, without danger and without violence, the

† *Tragedie de Don Pedro.*

“ Sire,—In following the route, practised up to this day, you will go directly towards a precipice ; in taking this other path, you will avoid the danger.”

“ Sire, you are a skilful architect, and yet you will never succeed in solidly constructing the edifice of social order and public welfare, if your contractors furnish you with bad materials, worked by unskilful hands, by inexpert artificers.”

“ Sire, I behold in you a physician of capacity ; but if you are deceived as to the cause of the malady of the body politic ; if the nurse who watches over it gives you false information of its sufferings, from being ignorant of the seat of those sufferings, you will prescribe a remedy which you will consider as a sovereign specific ; this specific will be but poisonous ; the malady will become contagious ; yourself, the physician, you will be the first victim to the inroads of the contagion.”

“ Sire, you are a good pilot ; inaccurate charts, a compass that has swerved from its true direction, will lead you into error. Whatever may be your capacity, you cannot flatter yourself with being *alone* able to direct the vessel of the state, you require assistance. The passengers, in traversing the straits of life, will perish with thirst and hunger, if your crew cast overboard the provisions for the voyage ; if these provisions are devoured by a marine monster, or by some am-

monarch and the nation ; which cites before the tribunal of public opinion *the errors of a minister*, the prevarication of an agent, and thus stifles the evil in its birth, by awakening the attention to the greater evil which would be the result of it.—(*Extract from the report of the commission of the chamber of representatives, upon the project of a law, relative to the liberty of the press.*)

phibious animal. They will be dangerously attacked with sea sickness, if, like the comrades of Ulysses, the sailors lend an ear to the seducing accents of syrens, while you are occupied at the helm. The passengers will at length perish with the pilot, and the sailors, if the crew working her badly cause the vessel to flounder about, and runs her on Carybdis, or on Scylla. Assure yourself, sire, of this great truth, that the vessel of the state sails continually between two rocks; that a good pilot is not sufficient, but that there must be a good crew to manœuvre her, to bring her into the roads, and to reach the port, *especially in the midst of a tempest.*"

"Your passengers, seized with panic, no longer make the air resound with their songs of joy; on their knees they address their prayers to the Eternal, in crying, "*Domine salvam fac patriam;*" do I swerve from the respect due to the sovereign authority, in sounding with all my strength, "*Domine salvam fac regem?*"

Thrice have I sounded this *domine salvam fac patriam*, and this *domine salvam fac regem*; my voice stifled here by feeble mortals, has not ascended to the Most High. I perceive it every day. Is it not better to present the torch and the mirror of truth, than to grasp the poignard of the hypocrite; the glass of the vile adulator, which throws objects at a distance; the censor of the courtier, which casts a mist before the eyes of kings, and conducts them to their ruin? I offer, as an example, Charles I., James II., and Louis XVI., without excepting Buonaparte.

If kings were governed by sound reason, they would prefer to their *professed friends*, such *enemies* as myself who do not offer one helping hand, while they grasp with the other the regicide dagger. Such criminal *enemies*, most criminal, because they speak the *truth*, cause monarchs to perceive the

sword of Dejotarus suspended over their heads. Their pretended friends hold the scissars ready at the first signal, and clandestinely to cut the thread which suspends the weapon. Unfortunate sovereigns! I pity you: you have indeed too great friends; you may tell them:—Let your affection for us be less passionate, and more moderate; we desire it; *such is our good pleasure*: for this time you may be permitted thus to express yourselves.

My advice is less fatal to your security than those grand professions, those pompous and nauseous eulogiums, which have acquired the mock appellation of *the holy water of the court*. Gentlemen of the court, less prattling, and more execution.

Do not exceed in any thing, says an old proverb, handed down to us by the Greeks. Excess in religion, is a false religion, which leads to fanaticism, in other words to crime.

Excess in politics produces fanaticism of another sort, which sells the state, and slays the monarch.

If we still believe our great talkers, we are not permitted to examine into the acts of the legislation. To demonstrate all the absurdity of this amiable maxim, I will ask, if the representatives are not the delegates, the persons invested with the rights of the people; if they are not charged to maintain the validity of their rights, and to deliberate upon the interests of the nation. These men, intrusted with the popular power, have an account to render to their constituents. These constituents reserve to themselves the right to approve of, or to improve upon the acts of their representatives, and to examine if they have fulfilled the tenor of their mandate. The people entrust to them a mission; and by accepting it, the representatives make an engagement to fulfil it.

We see the ministry committing errors unceasingly. It would be much to be desired that the judicial order might con-

fine itself to the study of the laws of Justinian, to apply them to the articles of the penal and the civil code. How should politics be understood in the temple of Themis? They are unknown in the sanctuary of the law. *Ne sutor ultra crepidam.*

My readers will open their eyes wider than usual, because they are not accustomed to read the naked truth, always disguised by falsehood and adulation. If caudour and loyalty were vices, adulation and baseness would then be virtues. The honest man does not burn incense before such idols: let those that like adore them. Truth bears a torch which throws light on every side. Adulation is the extinguisher, which produces obscurity, by conducting to the abyss dug by the passions.

I speak as I think; I think as I write; I have no mental reservation; we have sufficient knaves, hypocrites, and impostors: I will take good care not to increase their number. It is on this account that I will state important truths—the fruits of study and observation.

Moved by these sentiments, which have place only in superior minds, I will make use of the freedom of *freely* publishing my thoughts: Government and the ministry have no right to hinder me from it, I will exclaim with Voltaire,

“ Vous ne m’ oterez pas le droit *inviolable*

“ Que la loi de l’état ne’ravit qu’au *coupable*.”

“ You ne’er shall strip me of that *hallowed* right,

“ Which law’s harsh voice has but reclaim’d from *guilt*.”

As I write for the common safety and for the general interest, I will take care to stop at the point where license would begin. I know as well, perhaps better, than ministerial Aristarchuses, what are my privileges: I will enjoy them; I know my duty; I will fulfil it. I shall be bold, very bold; but *boldness is not licentiousness*.

SPEECH

SUPPOSED TO BE DELIVERED BY A REPRESENTATIVE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, ON OCCASION OF OPENING THE SESSION.

“ Le temps ramène l’ordre et la tranquillité ;
 “ Le peuple se façone à la docilité :
 “ De ses premiers malheurs l’image est affaiblie ;
 “ Bientôt il les pardonne, et mené il les oublie.
 “ Mais lorsque goutte a goutte on fait couler le sang,
 “ Qu’on ferme avec lenteur et qu’on rouvre le flanc,
 “ Que les jours renaissants ramènent le carnage,
 “ Le désespoir tient lieu de force et de courage,
 “ Et fait d’un peuple faible un peuple d’ennemis
 “ D’autant plus dangereux qu’ils étaient plus soumis.”

Orphelin de la Chine.

“ When social order, haleyon days return,
 “ The docile people moulds itself to peace :
 “ Of earlier stains th’ impression fainter grows ;
 “ Soon are they pardon’d, soon are they forgot.
 “ But drop by drop when blood is made to flow,
 “ Searee closed the gasping side, ere torn afresh,
 “ When carnage stalks upon the wings of morn,
 “ Courage and Strength go forth to wake Despair,
 “ From the meek eye now shoots a fiery glance,
 “ Chang’d is the lamb’s soft bleat to the fierce tyger’s roar.”

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NATION,

I appear in this assembly, holding in one hand the Gospel, in the other the moral Code of mankind. In the former sacred volume, the Almighty Creator has traced, in indelible characters, his divine precepts—precepts which are the foundation of the belief of every civilized people : *Succour the distressed, protect the weak and the innocent, love thy neighbour as thyself, DO UNTO OTHERS AS THOU WOULDST THEY SHOULD DO UNTO THEE.*

A celebrated writer has said with justice, that the science of politics is no less than *moral philosophy reduced to practice*. In ancient and modern times the policy of potentates has led them away from the sense of this maxim, the moral Code was not even opened, the blindness of courts concealed from the sight of the sovereign the true principles of government. This outrage on social order, this violation of institutions established by the Author of Nature, was the primitive cause of those disorders, of those catastrophes, which conducted nations to their decline and to their fall,

For the empire of the laws of morality, they substituted the empire of the passions. From this corruption of spirit, from this declination of the heart, sprung those circumstances, and those successive events, known by the denomination of *political vicissitudes and revolutions*.

Governments oppressed nations, nations staggered or overthrew governments. Hence that continual struggle between sovereigns and their people, which we see continued even in our days.

To gratify their passions, and those of their courtiers and parasites, potentates abused their power by sacrificing their duty and the general interest to the idol of courts, personal interest.

The subjects forgot in their heat the duties of society, because monarchs disdained to read and to practise the eternal laws of the Supreme: *do to another as thou wouldest he should do unto thee, if fortune, the dispenser in this world of the inequalities amongst men, had caused thee to be placed in the situation he is in.*

Succour thy unfortunate brother—Wretched man, thou wouldest be succoured.

Protect the innocent—Thou, being innocent, wouldest claim protection.

Respect the property of another—Thou wouldest that thy own should be respected.

Oppress not thy equal—Wouldst thou endure that he should oppress thee?

Be the father of the orphan—Wert thou an orphan, thou wouldest mourn for thy father.

Break the shackles of the slave—Wert thou a slave, thou wouldest long to be free.

From century to century, from age to age, from generation to generation, numerous copies of the genuine original portrait of the medley composition of the human mind, are perceived to multiply. The honest man in pursuing the journey of life, has encountered at every step the effects of the impiety of governments, and the traces of the misery of the people. His ears have been thunderstruck by the groans of misfortune. The friend of humanity, the moralist void of prejudice, the man *sincerely* religious, have sighed and have lamented. Yet do they sigh, and still do they lament. They, the new Heracliti, see nothing near the sceptre than Democriti, who laugh at their own blunders and their own errors.

These self-sufficient beings forgetting that their own favour is but transient, living in opulence, seated at sumptuous tables, surrounded by brilliant ornaments, dazzled by the splendour of their gilded palaces,—seem to be isolated from the rest of mankind, on whom they now and then cast a disdainful glance through the prismatic tube of grandeur. To found their fortune, they talk of devotedness, disdaining their equals to offer incense to kings; kindling the flame which consumes thrones, they at once destroy people and potentates.

The crafty policy of cabinets, tends but to the corruption of the people and to immorality; it without ceasing opposes vice to virtue; it is not the native policy of monarchs, but of those shallow, perfidious, or dissembling counsellors, who, deaf to

the voice of humanity, to the cries of conscience, withdraw themselves from their duties as citizens, as subjects.

To preserve the splendour of crowns, to perpetuate dynasties, to consolidate thrones, to strengthen social order, to confirm the power of the kingdom, to maintain the integrity of states and the indivisibility of nations, two principal methods present themselves to the penetrating eye of the philosophic observer, and of the political contemplator: *the union of sovereigns and of people—morality put in action.*

Those heedless revolutions, which, during so many centuries, have ravaged the globe, have borne the torch which has reflected the rays of experience before the eyes of civilized societies.

The influence of the past upon the present and the future, the fickleness of courts, the injustice of governments, the inconsiderate wars undertaken for the interest of one person forgetful of the sacred cause of the commonweal, have weakened the attachment of subjects for their kings. Sovereigns are not sufficiently convinced that union constitutes strength.

They have rendered sacred that absurd and dangerous maxim, which is not written in the moral Code, *divide to reign*, a paradoxical maxim professed by blindness and ignorance, disowned equally for the interest of the people, for the interest of the sovereign, by reason and good sense.

The personal interest of sovereigns is essentially allied to the common interest of their people. To do every thing for the people, is to do every thing for the sovereign; to do every thing for the sovereign, is to do nothing for him; a fundamental principle in policy, a principle unknown or misunderstood, from whence results this false maxim, *God and the King.*

God before all things; God is the King of Kings, the mo-

narch of a vast eternity, who governs this great universe subservient to the laws of his divine wisdom.

Our nation, our country, after our God. The sacred name of our country presents to the mind the collected idea of an infinity of beings, of human creatures, who claim a mutual support, a beneficent protection. From want of support and protection springs the clashing of the passions: from thence divisions, party spirit, civil wars, and the downfall of the royal authority, which is the consequence of them. *My God, my country, and my king.*

Union constitutes strength. Monarchs have no real power than the physical and individual strength which every one receives from the bounty of nature, in their birth and in their growth. It is their own strength that they have the disposal of, and from which they so impolitically separate and estrange themselves. Courts and cabinets are opaque substances, which interposed between the sovereign and the people, strip the monarch of the love of his subjects, and the subjects of the effects of the paternal care of the monarch. This clashing of opinion extinguishes the *amor patriæ*; the tie which reunites all interests. Love for the sovereign, self-love, personal interest, general interest, form but one single interest, which is discovered in a well governed nation, in *amor patriæ*.

Let us excite men by the stimulus of a common interest, we shall see the *amor patriæ* bud forth in their hearts; that pillar of the state, that principal rampart of thrones; against which, whatever may be the degree of human force comprehended in the hand which lances them, all its strokes will be impotent.

The inhabitant of towns and of the country, who is far removed from court, knows the monarch but by name: he judges of his actions, not by abstruse reasonings, but by facts. If he holds in his hands the bread of his children; if labour

turnishes this laborious man with the means of bringing up his family, and assisting his aged parent, he sees in the monarch a good father. In lieu of the benefits which he receives from him, he returns to him with interest, sentiments of love, and gratitude : he bears him a profound respect ; he sees in him a superior being ; *Deus hoc otia fecit.*

If his country is threatened by the sword of the enemy, if the security and life of the monarch is in danger, he takes arms, he flies to the frontiers, he defends his country to protect his family ; in fighting for his king, for his benefactor, let us not deceive ourselves on this point—he fights for himself. These several interests form but a single interest—the stay of *amor patriæ.*

If the peasant in the country, the artizan in the city, the inhabitant of the mountains, are in misery, will they patiently endure it ? Can one believe that a human creature will not make use of the instinct which he has received from the Creator ; that he will sacrifice his own interest for a government which neither affords him any protection or any benefit ?

In unhappy times, the man remains indifferent, and abandons himself to the mercy of events. If he remain indifferent with respect to the sovereign, will he be brought to defend him ? He will say alike with the soldier of Frederick the Great, who kept aloof from the field of battle : *I have no pretension to the crown, reign who will.*

Sovereigns and their ministers do not perceive that a mal-administration, and the blunders of governments, provoke this insensibility, which results from the defect of a relation between the interest of the monarch, and the interest of the people. They seem ignorant, that the people wish to be happy, and that the declaration of the Prussian soldier daily propagates itself.

To make the people do any thing for the monarch, it is

needful that the monarch should do a vast deal for the people. If the sovereign withdraws himself from his subjects, the subjects will withdraw themselves from the sovereign.

Governments have given birth to the chief cause of revolts and seditions. Instead of consolidating society, they divide it, and strip it of its natural adherence. Their carelessness, their errors, often reduce the people to a state of torture. The citizens are then constantly ripe for revolt: an attempt at amelioration, in this situation the effect of the natural constitution, is the last hope of the unhappy. Public felicity, then, is the protectress of social institutions: governments offend against all rules, in not leaning towards their preservation.

The principle of legitimacy is no safeguard against the inundation of the passions, and the results of the disorders which spring up in the bosom of indigence and misery.

Legitimacy is nothing else than the order of succession to the throne, forming an appurtenance to one single family in a political society, and whose hereditary right is consecrated by the constitution, or by the practice and usage of the people, without a direct ordinance.

When the people live in ignorance and blindness, the government rules them by superstition; but in proportion as they become civilized, they will become more enlightened, and as a consequence, less blind, less ignorant, and less superstitious. They burst the chain of servile obedience, to obey only the laws of reason and of justice.

Whenever legitimacy, sustained by the active force of an absolute monarchy, loses in the midst of political events its main support, it can only re-find its prop, its stability, in a good administration, and the wisdom of government. Can one, in fact, believe, that a people, groaning under the irons with which a tyrant, who derived his legitimacy from heridi-

tary right, should load them, would not cast off the yoke which he may impose on them, to place themselves under the paternal, moral, wise, and religious government of an Antonine, a Marcus Aurelius, a Henry IV. who would be illegitimate?

Legitimacy derives its source from illegitimacy. The first kings were not kings when they were created kings. Hugh Capet was elected to be a legitimate king by the high powers of the kingdom, who offered him the crown. The popes excommunicated kings and elected them afresh. Pope Stephen pronounced a sentence of excommunication against those who elected any other prince than a descendant of the House of Pepin—" *You shall choose no where else,*" said he, " *than in the House of Pepin:*" but he did not make mention of the eldest born. A statute of Charlemagne mentions, that if from one of the three princes, his children, there should spring a son, such as the nation desires to succeed his father, he begs his uncles to consent to it. To obviate the inconveniences of election, the law of hereditary succession was established for the interest of the state.

In going into this discussion I wished to prove, that with an absolute monarchy, legitimacy sustains itself by the exercise of absolute power; that with a democratic monarchy, it cannot sustain itself but by the aid of a sound administration.*

The object of every revolution is a change in the moral arrangement of the government; the end is attained when the citizens enjoy the power of pursuing the occupations of their choice, the fruit of their labour, the produce of their property, in

* The Journal of Debates of the 25th July last, contained an article upon legitimacy, in which I principally remarked this passage, digested by the soundest judgment.

" All the nation is called to enjoy the advantages of that edifice of which the royal charter has traced the plan. All the nation

purchasing at the smallest possible expense safety, tranquillity, and liberty. They spontaneously obey the laws of the state, and not the mandates of arbitrary power. In former ages, the sovereigns beheaded their subjects to glut their resentment, or assassinated the members of their family.—All these horrors in political affairs may be named. Was not all Greece beheld in arms, under the walls of Ilion, to reclaim a ravished beauty? Were not the Trojans beheld ranged under the standards of Priam to protect the rape of Paris? Thousands of warriors bit the dust in the Trojan plains; Ilion was reduced to ashes for a woman who connived at her being carried off. What policy, what morality put in action!

We in our times have seen a mild, insular cabinet, of whose science in governing it presumes to boast, cause a northern monarch to be strangled, whom it reproached with being the friend of France. Yonder was a conqueror, who caused a Bourbon to perish on the scaffold, in pretending to establish his dynasty. They have dared to name these assassinations true policy. Poor mortals—poor human nature! Wholesome policy neither authorises or excuses crimes. In fulfilling their duties, sovereigns preserve their crown; in attaining the end of their institution, governments strengthen themselves.

Let us frankly acknowledge, without passion or party spirit, if the chief of the imperial government had understood sound policy, if he had not been estranged from the people by his

“ought, after so many storms, to find in it a comfortable shelter. The “more the mass of the nation finds itself at ease in it, the more “also will it revere the monarch, his dynasty, and his legitimacy, the “key-stone of the roof of this grand edifice. Content and good-will are “the pillars of the state: they are supports more firm than all purely “speculative theories. Legitimacy ought in them to seek *its political* “*and genuine base.*”

boundless ambition, in violating fundamental laws; if he had *been occupied with the welfare of the French, instead of thinking to acquire an ephemeral glory by his conquests,* (for he could have rendered France happy,) never would Europe in arms have compassed the re-seating the Bourbons on the throne of Henry IV. The bulk of the people, satisfied with their government, would have multiplied the national forces; and affection for the sovereign, united with the personal interests of the subjects, would have annihilated the efforts of the coalition.

If at the æra of the 20th of March France had been wisely governed, the sovereign of the Isle of Elba had vainly attempted to advance on the French soil as Emperor—in his former subjects, he would every where have beheld enemies.

Assure yourselves of this political truth, that a people has no interest in changing the government, when it enjoys, under the reigning one, all the advantages which the political association, of which he forms a part, ought to present to each individual.

When one is desirous to prolong the duration of a state, says Aristotle, one must interest all parties in its preservation, and make them desire it too.

An unsound body politic, experiences the same affections as the human body: it tries all the positions in which it believes itself capable of finding an alleviation of its pains; it makes use of all the remedies that are presented to it in hopes of obtaining a cure; it will change its physician—it will even deliver itself into the hands of a quack, if it is persuaded that this last will heal it, or will restore it to health.

The encroachment, then, of sovereigns, on the rights of the people, is as absurd, as it is in opposition to all just principles. Considered as the fathers of a great family, monarchs act against nature. A good father ought to employ his soli-

ciude in uniting his children, in attaching them to him, in inspiring them with respect and with affection for his person. If this sacred bond, if this tie of nature is broken, with what disorders will not its dissolution be followed ?

This warfare actually exists in Europe. What is the result of this impolicy which bears witness to the ignorance of cabinets ? The misery of the people.

Let any one instance a single people tolerably happy, I will renounce my opinions, I will publicly abjure my errors, I will make an abject apology.

Now, the misery of the people of Europe being the work of governments, will any person of common sense believe, that in fighting against their subjects, the sovereigns will remain masters of the field of battle ? No; sooner or later, they will be worsted. Let them not be beguiled by early successes, the advantages of which will foil their expectations.

The people do not, as some superficial writers have pretended, tend towards republicanism ; but governments, by their false policy, are republicanising the people. This was the impolicy, these were the mistakes of the cabinet of Versailles, which republicanised France, and not the people.

Weary of being badly governed, the people essayed to govern themselves.

It is evident, that the desire of upsetting thrones, of beating down sceptres, does not constitute the public spirit of nations : but the people reclaim a healthful liberty, the enjoyment of their privileges, the means of turning their industry to account, of providing for the livelihood of their family. Every citizen demands a protection which is denied him. Governments do not fulfil their duties ; the end of their institution is defective.

The citizens groan ; they bewail their misfortunes ; they exert themselves to become more prosperous. Governments

tremble at the aspect of danger. Instead of employing the powerful influence of a paternal beneficence, they abuse their power in employing coercive force. They take effects for causes, causes for effects. Morality is no more put in action.

Let us talk less of religion, let us execute its divine precepts; the people will then love monarchies; they will cherish their monarchs, because they are happy under a monarchy. I repeat it, in conspiring against the people, sovereigns conspire against themselves. To do nothing for the people, is to do nothing for the monarchs.

The major part of the people of Europe is in a state of want and of misery; its situation is not superior to that of some of the people of the two Indies. The principles of civilization are not developed by governments, who unceasingly oppose obstacles to their developement. The people civilize themselves by the influence of the progress of knowledge, and the impulse of events, contrary to the desire of governments, who, in raising themselves above laws divine and human, scarce emerge from a state of nature.

Always at war, without any precise motives, without consulting the interest of the people, bewildered by their false policy, governments drive afar off abundance, the fruit of civilization, to replace it by a profusion of public calamities, which furnish new arms to the governed.

In this unsocial struggle the career of pretences and of errors aggrandizes itself. A writer of the last century said with reason, That war is a gaming-table, of which sovereigns are the bankers, and where the bubbled people stake their blood and their fortune. Are these gains substantial? A single hazard may ruin the bankers.

To perfect the social man, let us shew him the allurement of his private interest, in establishing the relations of citizen to citizen, of nation to nation. Those relations are not found

except in commerce. The system of Europe is prejudicial to commerce.

Is one nation pressed down under the weight of its misfortunes, the nation that sells to it experiences their repercussion. The one who received in exchange from the other sees its relations interrupted.

The system of England, that absurd system so much boasted of, that we would imitate, simple as we are, only tends to destroy the commerce of nations. In attaining its aim, ignorant and ambitious England would ruin its own commerce. A restricted, but a profitable commerce, is preferable to an extended one without proportional profits.

Its government grants a premium, and sells at a loss in the markets of its neighbours; in pretending alone to exercise a monopoly, in extending its relations to the four quarters of the world, its national gains are less considerable than those of a secondary nation would be in a time of prosperity. Its expenses are a great deal heavier.

The citizens pay directly, and above all indirectly, without being aware of it, the half of their revenue.

The national capital of England is smaller than ours, but it is less divided. It is from thence results the prejudice which we partake in, relative to the wealth of this country, where one beholds excessive opulence by the side of excessive misery. Mendicity lurks afar from high roads and corporate towns. While an inconsiderable part of the nation dazzles by its luxury in the midst of shame and superfluity, the result of the concentration of capitals, of the unequal divisions of fortunes, two millions of individuals are destitute of necessities. Since the time of Henry VIII. the poor rates have been permanent and increasing. Ought not a nation which carries on immense commerce, which has become the mart of the manufactures, and the mistress of the inhabitants of both the Indies, to

employ all her population. In fine, should the observer remark *a tax for maintaining the poor* of an industrious country in the budgets of a sound government? The effects of this system are perceptible in France and in Europe. The situation of England is not at all worthy of envy. Is it preferable to that of other nations, which she would ruin and enslave?

The established principles of freedom, of commerce, are incompatible with the exercise of its universal action in the hands of a single nation. The commerce of England will diminish in direct ratio with the ruin of that of its neighbours, and *vice versa.*

The alliances of sovereigns are not established upon the basis presented by sound policy. The potentates of Europe have signed at Vienna a holy alliance: is it really holy?

I cannot consider as *holy* an alliance which, against the rights of nature, has for its end oppression; and the consequences of which plunge the people in misery, by paralising their means of existence, by interrupting *in a time of peace*, the relations betwixt nation and nation.

I cannot regard that alliance as *holy*, which tends to perpetuate the hostility of sovereigns against their people. The political observer might cry aloud, *At last I discover this secret, which is full of horror.*

A holy alliance, an alliance truly *holy*, ought to present the application of morality, both natural and religious. Its result is the expression of the *holy* and *sacred* will of the Author of Nature. Sovereigns called by uncertain events, and by destiny, to govern the world, find the rules of their conduct, the model of their actions, in the moral code of mankind. If kings are images of God on earth, they ought to govern by tracing the outlines of human laws, on the laws of the Ruler of Kings —the divine laws.

" Ce sont là les héros qui gouvernent la terre ;
 " Ils font en se jouant et la paix et la guerre,
 " Du sein des voluptés ils nous donnent des fers.
 " A quels maîtres, grandes dieux ! lyrez-vous l'univers ?"
 " Such heroes, they who lord it o'er the earth ;
 " Who in their revels peace or war proclaim,
 " In pleasures lap our galling chains are rove.
 " Gods ! to what masters do you yield the globe ?"

To conclude, a *holy alliance* is sealed by the signet of humanity; it fraternizes the people, it re-unites them in one family: it perpetuates the existence of happiness in the bosom of nations, it avoids all disastrous wars, and by a *wise foresight*, by a solicitude emanating from a paternal sovereignty, it previously smooths all the difficulties which might in their consequences disturb the common security and felicity.

Will this *holy alliance* be of long duration? I cannot believe it; it does not comprehend the system of universal pacification, and of European fraternization. I do not permit myself to be easily dazzled by all the fine promises, the common places, the nauseous appellations which one finds in the writings, or which one hears proceed from the mouths of the confidants of power.

What has resulted from this *holy alliance*? France languishes, and sinks; the number of poor in Europe increases in an alarming manner: on every side one finds discontents, murmurings, revolts: the source of revolutions swells itself out, feeds itself, it will soon inundate the continent.

Can an alliance which causes these disasters, which produces such results, be actually *holy*? Are the negociators skilled in politics? Do they give proofs of their experience, when by furnishing fuel to the popular passions, they conduct sovereigns to their ruin? Their incapacity conspires, at once, then, against sovereigns and people. Poor people! poor sovereigns! I pity you!

These skilful negociators are in politics as scholars of the

sixth class in Latin. In the misery, the wretchedness of the people, the insurrections which the abuse of power provokes, behold their solecisms and their barbarisms. In the name of humanity, dismiss them, to learn their political syntax, in order that they may translate, into living language, the dead language of reason, the axioms of moral government, the duties of the statesman, the petitions of the unfortunate, and **THE CRUSADE OF THE PEOPLE.**

In the seventeenth century, Richelieu, Olivares, and Buckingham, alone directed, even without opponents, the affairs of Europe. France, Spain, and England, were, at this era, the three principal powers. We know the result of the policy of these ministers, the court intrigues, the capriciousness and the ignorance of the cabinets of Versailles, of Madrid, and of St. James's. We know that the cardinal, very far from being a stranger to the fall of Charles I. was clandestinely one of the most active agents in it. The hauteur of Charles had wounded the pride of the French minister.*

Ask the people of England, of Holland, of France, of Germany, of Spain, of Italy, &c. if they are contented and happy. Their situation, and their insurrections, will furnish an answer, eloquent and negative.

The honest man, in casting his eyes over Europe, sighs, on discovering a concealed fire. To extinguish the first flames, to avoid the conflagration, what will the sovereigns do? They will listen to the advice of their parasites; they will follow the mistaken route traced by their ministers; by those men so skilled in politics, who, nevertheless, will break in pieces, by their unskilfulness, the sceptre of their masters; will foresee events when they are under their eyes, and will remain stu-

* He wrote to Count d'Estrade: the King and the Queen of England will repent, before the lapse of a twelvemonth, having neglected my offers. They will know, soon enough, that they ought not to have despised me.

pified at the sight of the ashes of palaces, like unable physicians, who, in promising a cure, hold back, temporize, and next day are astonished at finding their patients in their last agony, or stretched under a pall. How destroy the effects in not knowing the causes?

The impolitic conduct of the allies towards France, is one of the principal causes of the misery of Europe, and of the continual emigrations which people the new world. Wretchedness forsakes its country, and goes, under a new climate, to seek peace, tranquillity, and happiness, which fly far from the native land of the inhabitants of kingdoms.

The idea of impoverishing us, by enormous contributions, of paralyzing our industry, of wearing out our national independence, has been presented to sovereigns, by the cabinets of Europe, as a sublime conception to put us out of the power of passing our frontiers. Mistaken sovereigns applaud this false measure, which is but a genuine political foolery.

Under a victorious prince, a nation becomes warlike; under a pacific prince, it loves peace, the object of all desires, the result of the progress of that knowledge which enlightens the people as to their true interests. Under a pacific government, the citizens are not disposed to take arms, but to gain real benefits and treasures, the national independence, the public tranquillity, and the enjoyment of their rights. Cabinets have perceived, that they could not enslave a nation covered with laurels, reaped by its warriors in the fields of Germany, and gathered by victory on the shores of the principal rivers of Europe.

An insidious policy led them to present themselves as allies, and the allies proclaimed themselves our friends; but if at the conclusion of their proclamation, they had promulgated the conditions of the Treaty of Paris, should we have opened our gates and delivered up our strong holds? The faith of oaths

then has been violated ; morality has not been acted upon. What policy ! What policy ! France, by the progress of its civilization, by the activity of its industry, the temperature of its happy climate, its topographical position, the fertility of its soil, and the importance of its population, is of great weight, not only in the political scale, but also in the commercial scale.

The equilibrium is destroyed. France, for these two years, has been deprived of its independence : a hundred and fifty thousand FRIENDLY bayonets insult its national honour ; its commerce, its industry are annihilated.

Since the holy alliance, what is become of this famed Europe, the most civilized, the most enlightened of the four quarters of the world, which contains the sanctuary of sciences and of arts ? What is the lot of its hundred and fifty millions of inhabitants ? What will become of the commerce of Asia, of America, of Africa, if misery continues to exercise its havoc upon the European soil ?

No more markets, no more relations between nation and nation. No more materials for the markets, no more commerce. No more commerce, we return towards barbarism. Commerce softens the manners, it is the tie between nations, it alone establishes between them an affinity of interests, it is the point of contact of improvements.

Let not any one now boast to me of the policy of European cabinets. Is it superior to the policy of an arrogant sultan, of a superstitious sophy, of a barbarous and suspicious khan, or of a stupid rajah ?

To convince yourselves, gentlemen, of the justice of my reflections, and to recognise their truth, cast a glance over France in 1814 : compare its situation and that of Europe at this period, with the actual state of affairs. We enjoyed our political independence ; the people were solely charged with the necessary taxes to cover the disbursements of the general ad-

ministration of the state; we were governed by our king, and disengaged from *all foreign influence*.

We surrendered our hearts to hope. At this day, the thermometer of our hearts is at despair, a degree of heat bordering on ebullition; there is yet one degree more, the bursting out of the passions, a term synonymous to revolution.

The waters of the Seine, of the Loire, and of the Rhone, are already swollen by the torrents of tears which our families shed.—Weep, weep, my country! to thy days of joy are succeeding days of mourning and of grief.

Since the Treaty of Paris, (November, 1815.) the body politic of France has continued paralysed. Europe experiences the re-action of its miseries, she participates in its woes.

In 1814 the treaty was negociated under the influence of a *Northern cabinet*; in 1815 the negociations were entered upon and terminated under the influence of a *Western cabinet*; hence the difference in our situation.

The one, emerging from barbarism, enlightens and civilizes itself in the school of the sorrowful experience of other people, and nobly marches forward: the other, even in the bosom of civilization, takes the road towards barbarism.

The better to conceal its artifices, it dazzles the people and loads them with chains of gold: it makes dupes; sovereigns are blind enough to suffer themselves to be duped—it profits of their blindness, and founds upon a fictitious power, usurped by corruption, its system of universal domination.

Is this domination suggested by the humanity which it so often invokes? Are its pretensions authorised by any articles of the moral Code of mankind?

Always eager to seize upon and to occupy, it evacuates but with difficulty and reluctance; it launches its political anathemas, its incendiary squibs, against the continental oppressor: no less an oppressor, it disseminates on the continent an in-

fectious gold. Realising the fable of Decalion and Pyrrha, each guinea which it casts abroad, causes a soldier to spring p. It extends its trident over the two hemispheres; it oppresses the land and the sea; it spreads through all the world plague, war, and *famine*. What moral science reduced to practice, *it does to others what all Europe would rejoice should be done to it.*

This insular cabinet, the witness of our prosperity, furious at having been foiled of its prey, treacherously framed the woof of vengeance under the shade of the olive of peace. It had just recognised the son of St. Louis; at Elba it already distilled its poison. On the shore of Cannes it stripped the lily of its leaf; on the shore of Cannes it cast loose a conspirator who worked up a military commotion. By its underhand practices, this same Bourbon, whom it had but newly recognised, lost his sceptre and his crown.

Boast, boast, if you still dare do it, the policy of the insular cabinet, you who call yourselves the friends of the family of Henry IV., you who declare yourselves the faithful observers of the catholic belief, the apostles of morality and of sound doctrines.

The insular cabinet will perhaps tell you that the treaty of 1814 was not the *holy alliance*, and that it could violate without scruple (according to its usual custom) the faith of treaties. But doubtless it will not tell you that its policy has in effect, on every occasion, known how to retain a forced construction, an ambiguous interpretation to its actions, like the oracles of Greece and Rome. A Roman oracle once said, “*Dico Romanos vincere Albanos;*” which also signifies, *dico Albanos vincere Romanos.* For myself, I exclaim; *parjure cabinet, cabinet parjure.*

The false policy of sovereigns, thus directed by a perfidious ally, has plunged Europe in a state of langour, want, and even

rebellion. Potentates, at length open your eyes; reason can alone dissolve the charm that binds you; lighted by the torch of truth, you will perceive with affright the menacing aspect of your people; you will see your thrones tottering under your feet: you will be convinced that some gems have been already detached from your crowns, during the continuance of your trance, by the awkward hands of those even to whom you intrusted the care of preserving your diadems untouched; you will see that these bunglers are always sufficiently clever to take themselves off, and to carry with them some precious jewels.

REPRESENTATIVES, the miseries of France are too well known to you. I will not undertake the painful, and for a good Frenchman, the too agonizing task, of here retracing to you the ungracious picture of them.

The representatives, in well ordered times, are called together by the monarch, to deliberate upon the taxes, and upon the ameliorations, which the good of the state and the public prosperity require, under a democratic monarchy. In periods of disaster, they have still more sacred duties to discharge—in applying a balm to the evils of the country, in pointing out the remedies which their superior information, their conscience, and their fellow feeling suggest to them.

Never did representatives assemble under circumstances more calamitous. You have to repair the social edifice, which is giving way; to prop up the monarchy, which is tottering.

The present is before your eyes; call to mind the past; reflect seriously on the future. Never, no, never did the imperious necessity so fully manifest itself, of fulfilling your duties, *by using the latitude of your rights*. You will not be servile imitators, blind slaves of a monarch, or cringing tools of his ministers.

Slaves of a monarch—the representatives stifled the voice of nature; the cry of their conscience. Guilty of high treason to

the nation, they sold the state to its chief ; they were not regicides, but patricides.

The tools of ministers--the representatives forgot the value of their rights; they mistook the importance of their duties. Their voice was the parody of their sentiments : one culpable condescension made them forget what they were, what they ought to be.

For a long time, in the sanctuary of the laws, France has only perceived MANIKINS ; France wishes at last to see there MEN.

The representatives were *deaf, dumb, and blind* from their birth. *Deaf*—they shut their ears to the cry of the people, which reproached them with the turpitude of their conduct, the venality of their character, and the violation of their oaths. *Dumb*—they restrained from speaking ; forgetting the prerogatives of the independence of the national representation, they kept silence : their duties commanded them to speak, to point out abuses, to avoid the errors which compromised the honour and the security of the country. *Blind*—they were strangers to their due power, in putting in the mouth of the people words which were not its own. They sailed without a compass, and wandered out of the track with error, who served them as their guide. Their mission terminated, they resumed their stations as citizens, rejoined their hearths, and found on their arrival the spectacle of the groans of their brethren, whose sorrowful regards interrogated their conscience, whose weeping eyes seemed to ask them, *What have you done for us ? What have you done for the country, delegates of the people ?* Behold the desolation of that France, of which you were the chosen : behold her feet, her hands, her body, her heart : behold her wounds continually bleeding ; and start back with fear, unnatural sons, who prolong the agony of a tender mother. View those fathers, those mothers, those young infants, who fly their native soil : behold the grass which covers

the solitary streets of the cities, which you tread under foot ; cast your eyes on every side, on every side you will behold countenances furrowed by misery ; the walls of your palaces ; hid from you the sight of misfortune ; and at the time you enjoyed your plentiful meals, thousands of Frenchmen, who are your brethren, your equals, perished with hunger, turning a dying eye-lid on you. *What have you done for them ? Have you put morel theory in practice ?*

I am pleased to think that this year I shall not speak to the *deaf*, that I shall not unveil the truth to the *blind*, that I shall not give good and wholesome counsel to the *dumb*.

What innumerable errors, prejudices, sophisms, and paradoxes, have you not heard professed and pronounced at this tribune, amidst some wise and luminous discussions ! It is my duty to combat a prejudice disseminated amongst you, which does not only attack truth and public order, but which is contrary to the political institutions of a *monarchi-democratie*, that is to say, a *representative government*.

Can a sovereign actually, and by prescriptive right, give a constitution to a nation ? No—the power of *conceding*, is derived from the power of *granting or refusing*. One cannot *grant or refuse*, but that of which one has the *possession or the disposition*. To give or to grant a constitution, is to make a *concession*. Constitutions have for their base the rights of the people, those imperishable rights, which, once lost, are refound in natural morality, and in religious morality.

From the right of property, from that sacred right which comprehends persons and things, the fundamental base of social order, flow all the other rights stipulated in the contract, which are, in some sort, the extension or the interpretation of the right of property.

To acknowledge that a monarch can deprive his subjects of the enjoyment of these rights, would be to consecrate the absurd and false principle in politics, that sovereigns possess

rights over persons and things, and that they are at liberty, *according to their good pleasure*, to exercise these rights, or *to concede the enjoyment of them to their subjects*. Now this right of property, which comprehends persons and things, would become, in the hands of the sovereign, a right *over life and goods*. Such an assertion would be horrid, and in opposition to natural morality and religious morality.

Monarchs, the supreme guardians of states, *tutores status publici*, are, then, unable to concede that which does not belong to them. Under absolute monarchies, sovereigns usurp those rights which the people alone receive from that universal justice, which has neither date, nor period, nor term; which emanates from God, and which we alone understand by the blessing of reason. When absolute monarchies lose, by means of the progress of civilization, the unlawful power which cloaked the rights of the people, an alliance forms itself between sovereign monarchy and popular democracy, which one might name *a holy alliance*. There is no concession on the part of the sovereign: but the democracy, which represents the people by the aid of the strength which it borrows from events, re-assumes the hereditary, unalienable property of its ancestors, usurped by monarchy, or by the ancestors of the monarch.

The rights of the people form so many fundamental laws, expressed by the articles which compose the *constitutive part* of the social contract. As these rights form a national dependency, the establishment of the fundamental laws appertains, then, *facto et jure*, to the nation which constitutes the government, seeing that the existence of the government is established upon the existence of the nation. The nation commences by forming itself, and then the government receives birth. There is no government without a nation; there is no nation without a people.

The digesting of the *constitutive part* of a contract, of a constitution, of a charter, being the imprescriptible privilege of the nation, as *constituent*, the digesting of the *administrative part*, is the privilege of the sovereign, as the *supreme guardian* of the state.

In a simple monarchy, the power of which is tempered by fundamental laws, the sovereign governs *according to his good pleasure*, in resting his acts on fundamental laws. The experience of all ages demonstrates the necessity of moderating the *good pleasure* of sovereigns, in the exercise of legitimate power; the craziness, the nonage, the extravagancies of the depositaries of monarchical power, which the monarch cannot alone exercise, have imperiously demanded the rein presented by the national representation, which reserves to itself an active part in the civil and political legislation; thence its right in the co-operation of the *administrative part* of the contract, which indicates the form of government, the nature and the elements of the administration of the state.

When an *absolute monarchy* becomes a *democratic monarchy* in virtue of a contract, the monarch cannot frame the laws which establish and govern the extent and the restriction of his powers, and which give him a new existence, as a *constitutional monarch*, the chief citizen of the state, the chief subject of the laws.

Let us not confound the rights and the duties of a nation born republican, (as the United States of America) with those of a nation which recovers its rights, usurped by an absolute monarchy. A nation which, governed by a democracy, elects a monarch, dictates the laws to him, and traces out to him one sole constitution. This monarch, born again, has not any specific right; the nation expresses its full and entire will.

Remember, that in discussing questions of high political

moment, it is essential to follow them in all their gradations, and to proceed, by regular degrees, to reason from consequences, otherwise one would stray away, without ceasing, in following the impulse of erroneous opinions, and individual interests, into the labyrinth of imagination.

The *lawful rights* of the monarch, an inheritance made valid by ancient conventions, written or understood, and by the lapse of time, being placed in presence of the *natural rights* of the people, the sovereign finds the value of his rights: the nation recognises their own: the contract is the result of a *negociation*, and not the *expression of the sovereign will* according to the good pleasure of the monarch, seeing that he cannot grant *that which does not belong to him*: but he claims, without reserve, *that which does belong to him*.

When the chamber of 1815 digested, in July, a constitution, in order to present it to the legitimate heir of the throne of Henry IV., the representatives departed from the principles of policy, in suppressing titles. The hereditaryship of titles is an appendage of our ancient monarchy. To recognise the rights of the monarch, is to restore him the monarchical dependency. The nation, recovering with its rights *the equality of rights*, consequently wiped out the privileges and the prerogatives which formed *the inequality of rights*.

I am not a republican, gentlemen, but the zealous partisan of a *democratic monarchy*. This form of government is the most adapted to a great nation. Well constituted, it offers, in avoiding the inconveniency and the disorders which absolute monarchy, oligarchy, and polygarchy, drag in their train, the advantages of a republic. Our government does not avoid these inconveniences, because it is badly constituted—I say it openly. It is not, in France, identified with the representative system; it reasons, it discourses too superficially upon the elements which compose it. Like the monster that Horace

pictured in his Art of Poetry, our government is a shapeless assemblage of heterogeneous parts: always vacillating, it is impossible that it can ever be perpendicular, since the foundation is wanting. If any political breeze oversets it, will it be my fault? I have defended it from them often enough: what can I do more?

“ Vint fois il a suffi pour changer tout l'état
 “ De la voix d'un pontife ou du cri d'un soldat.
 “ Ces soudains changemens sont des coups de tonnerre
 “ Qui, dans des jours sereins, eclatent sur la terre.
 “ Plus ils sont imprevus, moins on peut echapper
 “ A ces traits devorans dont on se sent frapper.”

VOLTAIRE, *Irene.*

“ The churchman's voice, or crested soldier's cry,
 “ Many times and oft have overthrown the state,
 “ Such sudden changes fall like thunder claps,
 “ Whieh from a heav'nly sky, burst on the earth.
 “ When least expected, hardest then to 'scape,
 “ These ravenous bolts that senseless strike us down.”

I will examine another question: can there exist a government *de facto* and a government *de jure*? The government *de facto* is also a government *de jure*: it rules by the laws of power, if it has a conqueror, a despot for its head, or by means of the voluntary submission of the subjects who have recognised him, and who obey him. A monarch who has lost his crown, governs neither *de facto* nor *de jure*. The head of a state receives the impulse, and communicates it to the social body. He is the mover of the political mechanism, the administrator of the public weal. The monarch without a crown neither receives nor communicates any impulse: he puts no action in motion; he does not direct the public weal; he does

not, therefore, govern at all. A government should exhibit *unity* of action; if two governments existed, there is no more *unity*.

Now these words, *the right to govern*, and *governing by right*, do not present the same idea. There exists a great difference between *having rights*, and *exercising them*. The sovereign who governs *de facto* and *de jure*, is an *active being*: a candidate for a throne is a *passive being*.

A monarch, therefore, set aside from the throne, neither reigns *de facto* nor *de jure*: he enjoys but the hope of regaining, and the power of *making the best of his rights* before the tribunal of nations, which in politics, maintains the *ius arbitrium*.

I proceed, gentlemen, to notice to you many other prejudices. Is there one of them which is more offensive to the national independence than that which we have been fain to seek beyond the channel, in antiquated England, which still preserves the evil practices which the inexperience of its youth, and the heat of the passions, have caused it to contract? *The majority of the two houses of parliament ought to side with the ministers.*

Sound policy, in other words, the genuine science of government, does not acknowledge the existence of two parties in a deliberative assembly: she adopts the majority, or the minority, of the votes, or of the scrutiny. From the unchangeableness of opinions springs party spirit: party spirit results from the influence of the passions: when the passions domineer, honour trembles, truth wavers, conscience is mute, and virtue faints away. If the passions usurp the reins of judgement, can the deliberations of the assembly upon the great interests of the throne and of the country arrive at maturity? The laws are defective, they are abrogated, they are modified, each year. Is the multiplicity of laws the characteristic of a good government?

To pretend that *the majority should side with the ministry*, is very ingeniously to assert, that it ought to execute the orders of ministers, and adopt their plans without examination. If ministers give commands, the representatives cease to be independent. What becomes of the rights of the nation, sanctioned by our constitution? To consecrate a principle so false, is to annihilate the national representation, to deprive the sovereign of friends, of advisers, to violate the fundamental laws of the state; it is to substitute in France for the yoke of a military despotism, the yoke of a ministerial despotism; it is to go on from abuse to abuse, from prejudice to prejudice, instead of effecting a salutary reform of abuses and prejudices; it is to make a retrograde march.

If monarchs and ministers enjoyed the enviable privilege of neither committing errors or extravagancies, a national representation would become useless: the fundamental laws, the knowledge and the wisdom of princes would suffice; but the annals of nations transmit, from age to age, the sorrowful experience of the contrary. Reason, equity, and history, have demonstrated, even as I have already said, the necessity of presenting a bridle to the disorders of courts. This bridle is not to be found but in a national representation.

Suppose, gentlemen, that the ministers might sell to enemies the state and its head, would they promulgate their design? No; to arrive at their end, they would cloak it under the veil of the public good, thence reckoning on men entirely at their devotion. If, in this hypothesis, the representatives blindly followed the route traced by ministers, would they not become indirect conspirators against the throne and the state? They would partake, unconsciously, in the crime of ministers. Witnesses of the catastrophe, they would deplore, though too late, their culpable condescension: the evil would be without remedy.

Representatives, I do not at all partake of your prejudices: you will see me sitting indifferently, sometimes on the right side, sometimes on the left. I will speak for or against the adoption of the project of a law, according to the impulse which my voice receives from my conscience. I shall approve, I shall improve, or I shall stop at a middle course. Attending the issue of the ballot, or the casting up of votes, I will tell you if I am in *the majority or the minority*.

You are mechanically told, that an opposition is necessary, that it retains ministers in the circle traced by their duties: you are told also, that the clashing of opinions throws light on the discussions, and even on the government itself: pitiful assertions!

For myself, I assert that it is not one portion of the assembly alone that ought to check abuses, *but the entire assembly*: that light cannot spring from the midst of discussions nourished and sustained by party spirit.

A minister, with a devoted party of adherents composing the majority, will brave the clamours of opposition, certain before-hand of attaining his end. Of what use was the opposition, last year, which was never heard? Will they say that it recommended economy? Will they say, that its advice has been followed? Will they from thence draw this inference, that the opposition is necessary? I will answer, that these recommendations should be addressed *indifferently* by all the members of the assembly, whatever may be the side to which each of them is attached; that a representative fulfils his duty in presenting his views of amelioration; that in the side *opposed to the opposition*, there are found as well intelligent and enlightened men, who should offer useful advice.

Our government, being an imitation of the English government, established in the seventeenth century, (we live in the nineteenth) it has been said, let us have an opposition, be-

cause it exists in the House of Commons ; for the same reason the hereditaryship of the peerage has been imitated, because this hereditaryship has been maintained in the House of Lords since the seventeenth century. Will you, gentlemen, compare the motives which have given rise to these institutions in the two nations ; you will convince yourselves, that they are essentially different in their nature ; that we are but unskilful parodists.

The English opposition received its birth in the faction of the puritans, under the reign of James I. ; it appeared in parliament under the name of the *Whigs* : it proclaimed, in a high tone, independence, conducted Charles I. to the scaffold, and has since combated with heat and determined obstinacy, the royal power and prerogatives which the Tory party defended.

The opposition in England is, therefore, in some sort, the declared enemy of royalty and of government ; in France, it is the most firm support of it. What extravagance !

Our majority protests its affection for royalty, and its attachment to the country ; the minority makes the same protestations. *You are unanimous*, gentlemen, and by a singularity worthy of remark, *you differ*.

You take then a bad copy of a bad picture ; you change the shades, the colours, the expression of the personages ; but you faithfully depicture in it the obstinate combat of the passions : the people pay with their tears the costs of this insignificant warfare.

The members of the English opposition are not the real friends of the nation, but impudent caballers ; machines, in short, which the minister can move by the attraction of guineas and of places, which is his most powerful resort. What policy ! What a fine example to follow, in a country so enlightened as our own !

It is to be remarked, that the opposition and the ministerial

party in France are composed of the same individuals ; when, on the contrary, they ought *to be opposed to each other*. If the permanent opposition is superior in number, the projects of the laws will be rejected by party spirit. If the ministerial party has the permanent majority, all the projects will be approved, often by contradiction or by anticipation. Can a government march with a firm step, with a national representation so badly organized.

Two examples of these weighty inconveniences are offered by the two last sessions of 1815 and 1816 : they would prove in favour of my assertions, if common sense and the study of policy did not unveil all the absurdity of this prejudice. In the majority of our chamber is the majority, and even the totality of members, who receive distinctions or pensions from government. The minority is less dependent. This vicious institution of the national representation furnishes results, to which I seriously call your attention. If policy was better understood, these elections would not draw after them any unlucky consequence. The majority then side with the ministry, either to preserve their places, or to obtain new ones from the ministerial patronage ; the sole source from whence employments are given away. It will be easy for me to shew, that under these circumstances, placemen blinded by prejudice mistake their duties.

As representatives they are independent of the law ; they are again as civil, judicial, and military functionaries, invested with two characters. As representatives they have a commission from the people, and their oaths to respect, they ought to occupy themselves with the general and individual interests of the nation. As functionaries they are the defenders of the throne. But the security of the throne depends on the security of the state ; the obligations which their double character imposes on them coincide and confound each other.

A government existing but by social interest, its existence depends on a fundamental principle,—the existence of the nation. To be active, then, in promoting the national interest, is to be active in promoting the interest of the government, in strengthening its foundations, in consolidating its existence. If the social body suffers, languishes, is exhausted, the government, the moral being, the soul of that body, receives the reaction of it. Natural pains affect the moral system, an established truth, which it is impossible to contest. France languishes, suffers, is exhausted, what is the state of its government? No dissimulation, gentlemen, be candid; it totters.

If we listened to all our trifling, political babblers, we should repeat with them, that the dawn of happiness shines on France; that the government is closely united. Similar absurdities, professed by treachery, folly, or baseness, tend only to aggravate our evils, when we are urgently called on to make an honourable endeavour to heal them.

Representative functionaries, in opposing projects of a law, when natural equity counsels them to it, at once serve their country and their sovereign. If all the propositions of a law were not susceptible of examination, of rejection, or of modification, they would only be presented to comply with *forms*, and to follow the *routine* of the constitution, the representation would be null.

But, I repeat it, monarchs and their ministers are not infallible. Have they all the requisite qualities to be so? No, the throne, and the approach to the throne, are too far separated from the shed of the manufacturer, the counter of the merchant, the shop of the tradesman, the humble retreat of the annuitant, the fields of the labourer, the dwelling of the artisan, and the pallet of misery. The wants of the people cannot be well understood but by the representatives, who, on their return to their departments, receive esteem or disdain

and new information, or receive *new lessons* of which they ought to avail themselves during the new session.

Sovereigns being deceived by their ministers, and the ministers by their subordinates, the representatives set them right, and serve them as guides to attain to the common end the public welfare, the national prosperity, which I cannot too often repeat it, are the objects of the institution of every government. It is, in fact, in this, that the inappreciable advantage of the national representation consists. Do the deputies wander from their duties immediately this advantage disappears;—the end is not attained; the people groan; the vessel of state beats about in the midst of rocks; a tempest overtakes and overwhelms it; terrible effects of the indifference manifested in the study of policy; melancholy results of the absence of the *amor patriæ*: the influence of private interests, and the counsels of self-sufficiency.

If our ministers were better informed in this sublime science, worthy the reflections of the honest man, since it comprises the art of rendering the people happy, instead of seeking to lead the representatives by the nose in pointing out to them a recompense for their silence in *elevations*, a punishment for their zeal in reprobation, or *depriving them of their places*, they would rather put themselves under their guardianship, by demanding from them their *counsels* and their *advice*. It was thus, that Sully, the minister of Henry IV. deported himself. Sully I invoke thy manes! Sully I cannot perceive thy shade.—

This statesman was the sincere friend of his king, of that beloved Henry whose memory I revere, whom I offer as a model to all kings; who, *in placing himself under the guardianship of the ablest men of the nation, by demanding from them their counsel and their advice, avowed with reason, that this desire had but little influence with kings, with grey hairs, with conquerors like himself.*

This desire in effect did not at all animate the towering soul of the emperor, the victorious Napoleon, the guardian of his filial subjects, the grand trustee of their interdicted representatives, members of an order of madmen, of which the grand trustee was grand master. Avow gentlemen, that if in *principio rerum* had sent to Charenton the grand master and his knights, we might have spared France many tears and sufferings.

Under a well constituted government, the national representation ought not to set itself in array against the minister; but a minister acts imprudently and impolitically in asserting a pretence to enslave freemen invested with a sacred character, whose noblest privilege is the right to speak with boldness and loyalty, and consequently without dissimulation and without cringing.

Representatives of the left side enjoy then your rights. Representatives of the right side you enjoy your privileges if you respect them; but forget not your duties, in forming in the bosom of the council of your family *a permanent opposition*.

Gentlemen, let us not imitate our neighbours; we have sufficient information in France to govern ourselves; all we require is to use it. Would you have evil-spirits discontented with your conduct and your deliberations, say on perceiving your palace, the little word the term which Piron made use of in passing before the gates of the Academy.

Let us borrow from the English their national spirit, and nothing more. Must we pay them a heavy interest for this loan; we shall be amply indemnified by the immense advantages which we shall derive from it.

Representatives, re-unite yourselves, let this tribunal be the altar of concord; cease to burn incense there, the vapours of which are contagious. You will listen to me, you will

hear me if I speak to you in the name of honor, of reason, of humanity. You were only led away by false principles, by the little passions inherent in human bosoms: but nature has permitted the cry of conscience to stifle the voice of the passions. You are not corrupt: you have a conscience, a heart, and a soul; with such men as you I will make such men as myself: I know no passion but that of the public good; imitate me: when I speak to you, your duty appeals to you: I will march the first on the path which it traces out for you. Representatives follow me.

Representative, you will say, what right have you to hold such language to us? I will answer you by reciting these lines of Voltaire :

“Les droits qu'un esprit fort et ferme en ses desseins

“Exerce sur l'esprit des vulgaires humains.”

“Rights which a spirit bold and firm in deed,

“Holds o'er the humours of the vulgar herd.”

A bold spirit, I know how to use my rights: firm in my designs, I fulfil my duties as a faithful subject, a loyal representative, the friend of my country, a respecter of religion, a zealous follower of morality; imitate me: abjure your errors: the country in tears conjures you to do it.

“A tous les cœurs bien nés que la patrie est chére !”

“To noble minds how sweet does country sound !”

At the single name of country, more than five and twenty millions of French, of every sex and of every age, appear before your eyes, whom the God of all nations directs you to love as your brethren, as yourselves.

If you were compelled to find bread for your children by the sweat of your brow, could you, without groaning, without

murmuring, without deplored your misfortunes, hear the council of the family speaking exclusively of the *wants of the treasury*, when some voices would exclaim, *succour thy unhappy brother!*

The wants of the treasury! These words signify “gold, “gold, gold must be had. To obtain it we must melt down “in the crucible of inexorable and barbarous finance, the “clothes which cover the workman, the bed upon which “he reposes after the fatigues of the day: that bed which he “now bathes with his tears, becomes for him a bed of “mourning.”

What will be left to the indigent wretch without an asylum, without the means of existence? Eyes to bewail his misery; arms to protect himself, if the government refuses him the protection which every citizen has a right to exact *in exchange for his sacrifices*.

Is it not to abjure all the principles of morality and policy, to exact by the arm of power sacrifices, without rendering *back with usury their counter-value*.

Imposts, under a representative government, are the offerings deposited by the people on the altar of the country, of which the governing power disposes to assure to each individual the enjoyment of his rights, the security of his goods, and of his person; the power of turning his industry to account. It recalls to you these principles resting in oblivion.

If our right side has told you, THE PEOPLE *have great wants*; the faithless echo by a singular acoustick effect has repeated from the left side, THE TREASURY *has great wants*. The right side has added, France is in distress: will you assuage, or will you perpetuate these sufferings? The echo has made no reply, another acoustick effect: *mirabile visu*.

During your last session the misery increased: honest men, the friends of the public weal, apprised you of it; they preached

in the desert. The organs of government talked to you of prosperity, they announced to you as near at hand the termination of your evils; this period is daily more and more distant. We are weary of hearing this idle stuff fit for the amusement of children. We are men *facts, facts, and fewer words.*

It appears that the government have undertaken the task of deceiving the people by their counter truths: but, in France, we must have truths. Would it not be absurd to announce from the tribune, or to proclaim in the gazettes, that happiness shines upon us, that union replaces discord, when the hearers, the readers, even do the ballad singer and the porter, know to the contrary, not only by the points of contact which unite them to each other, but still more by experience, the evidence of facts, and the perception of their own unhappy condition? Would it not be pretending to persuade a miserable wretch that he is happy? What absurdity! what narrow views!

False systems, political heresies, deceitful promises, cannot dazzle an enlightened people as to their real interest. Let the efforts of the government tend towards the common good, let these efforts be ostensible, let each month produce an approximation towards welfare, the people will suffer patiently, because each step will conduct it towards an amelioration of its lot: but if these steps are retrograde, what guarantee will it have for its future happiness, and for promises which are not realized? It is not by words that the people are soothed, let us cause hope to spring up, which supports man even on the verge of the tomb.

The government of states exacts a scientific tactic, above all in critical circumstances. False measures make an attack on public security; half measures betray inexperience in administration; general measures produce the happiest results. One cannot effect general measures but in making all the

constitutive parts of the administration coincide. If the government is of itself badly constituted, if it wants some links in the administrative chain, one will perceive no harmony in the acts of authority; like Penelope, they will untwist at night what had been done in the day; the situation of the state will be stationary; the least commotion will cause it to fall back towards the abyss opened to swallow it.*

To create general measures, it is necessary to move on to the end without being frightened by obstacles, to consider things in their principles and their effects, not to take the artificial state of a country for its natural state, (a very important distinction) not to step aside from general principles on account of some inconveniences in the details: in a ready perception of passing events, to embrace an entire view of things, and to calculate the influence of every part on the other. Behold positively what the ministers do not, and what they ought to do to reach the end from which they are wandering. In reality, I do not see in them statesmen.

Laws of restriction on the liberty of the subject destroy neither effect nor cause; they become new causes which produce new and dangerous effects. Was the law of 1815 on individual liberty, which writes to us the frightful law regarding suspected persons during the revolution, in unison with the institutions of a paternal government? The law regarding suspected persons was the arm which the popular anarchy

* With half measures the government will lose the state; with general measures it will save it. It does not suffice to fret the people with finance; it must watch over the preservation of the means of existence. A government which acts for the general interest makes itself the friend of the people: the number of the seditious and of the malcontents sensibly diminishes; then no more temporary laws, no more injury to the spirit of fundamental laws.—(*Extrait de ma Medicine Politique.*)

made use of to strike those blows, which sapped the foundations of the social edifice. The law of October, 1815, created an administrative anarchy. The governed became the victims of the individual resentments of magistrates, who forgetting the cause of government, oppressed the citizens under the egis of the law. Animosities kept alive party spirit. The despotism of magistrates made new enemies to government, by virtue of a law promulgated in order to diminish their number, by retaining the disaffected within those bounds of respect due to the sovereign authority.

This law was brought forward in 1816. Individual liberty however underwent a new restriction. The motives which called for it at that era, will be still more powerful this year, for the number of the enemies of government is increased. You know it they will nevertheless tell you the contrary. No dissimulation, be sincere; the proof is founded on the facts.

If you disdain to apply principles, will you refuse to inform yourselves by experience? What should be the consequence of this series of total want of observation and of your blindness? Will you be convinced that it is only by a sound administration, supported upon unvarying principles, that laws of exception can be avoided amongst a people governed by the empire of a wise liberty, of a liberty free from licentiousness. You will aggravate our evils, if you impart to our fundamental laws all their plenitude of execution without adopting general measures. Look to it: this judicious reflexion merits to fix your attention.

Will you suffer yourselves to be guided by a blind spirit of imitation? Will you search after a model for your guidance in the *three united kingdoms*, which I name the *disunited kingdoms*? This nation has just suspended the *habeas corpus*, because it is basely governed. In proof of it I offer you facts, facts, facts, and not allegations suggested by animosity and

treachery. Facts are peremptory arguments: *Two millions of poor, numerous emigrations to the continent, revolts, seditions, conspiracies.* Must we again take a copy of this alarming picture, in confounding causes and effects? Our absurd system of imitation, is therefore one cause which renews amongst ourselves the effects which are perceived in the nation we imitate: the same causes produce the same effects.— Representatives, be not blind: does a happy, and consequently a well-governed people, comprise a considerable quantity of indigent persons? Does it present the spectacle of rebellions, the aim and the motive of which is an amelioration of the lot of all? No: a happy people cherishes its government. What could it gain by any change?

“ Faut il perdre l’Etat pour le mieux gouverner ? ”

“ To rule it better must one sink the state ? ”

Last year I announced important truths: nobody listened to me; all my predictions are realised. Therefore I have acquired a better right than any one, let him be who he will, to speak and to write.

I have said,—Can public misery, and above all the misery of the lower people, a part of whom have not even necessaries, still continue for one or many years? If the sentiments of glory and honour, if the desire of preserving their happiness, their tranquillity, and their liberty, lead men to great actions, and inspire them with courage; the sentiments of misery can lead them to great excesses.*

Discontents are generalising themselves in France: it is time to think of the happiness of the people.†

* In my Medicine Politique, published in February, 1817, addressed to the ministers.

† In the same work.

To make no innovations is to wish to upset the government which, very far from consolidating itself, is taking hasty strides to its ruin.*

We speak of our country; we do not apply the smallest remedy to its evils; we wish to do every thing for the king, we do nothing for him; we ought to do every thing for the country, we do nothing for it; and by the effect of these false measures of administration, discontents propagate themselves throughout France, from East to West, from North to South. Seditions do not make themselves heard, but their source flows in large waves, and the first billows are very soon going in our view to precipitate themselves into the political reservoir. And yet they tell the King of France that his states are tranquil; and the future bears a propitious aspect.†

Would they pretend to strengthen the throne and consolidate the government by *increasing* mendicity and beggary, by furnishing new arms to the evil-disposed, by causing the source of seditions to rush forth in large waves.‡

I have spoken important truths; perhaps I have been looked upon as a fool. Was the person then very foolish, very weak, who recommended to you the knowledge and the application of political principles? Was this fool truly senseless, who desired you to deprive the citizens of occasions for becoming culpable or criminal: government of the sad necessity of punishing faults which it ought to prevent, and who reminded you that you ought to foresee events before they were under your eyes.

Have I done wrong in speaking with boldness?

* Idem.

† In my Address to the Chamber of Representatives, published in November, 1816.

‡ In my Philosophical Essay on the grand Art of governing a State, presented to the Chamber of Representatives, in December, 1816.

Have we not seen in all the departments, revolts, seditions, which it was in the power of government to prevent: *and executions which it should have avoided?*

When the administration pretended to rally men of talents, to destroy party, to re-unite the French in one family, to re-establish the salutary empire of religion, I predicted that it was groping about in the dark to attain its end: that it was on a mistaken route: am I deceived? facts verify my predictions.

Observe, gentlemen, the result of this false policy is, that in 1817, we are more wretched and have more to complain of than in 1816. Sophists and superficial reasoners, will doubtless observe, that *the intemperature of the seasons* is one cause which has produced this effect. Poor creatures! poor human kind! shall you not grow tired of talking nonsense?

To attribute the public misery to heaven, is to insult the supreme king who governs heaven and earth. Only behold how men instead of confessing their feebleness, their errors, their blunders, when they cannot charge them on some one or other of their equals, find it more simple and more expeditious to impute them to God! What blasphemy! what sacrilege! what moral science brought into action!

Has the christian morality directed us to doubt the divine wisdom of the Almighty, and to believe that the eternal has resolved according to his good pleasure, to famish the people? Variations of the atmosphere have existed at all times: they will exist to all eternity. If God permits or wills that mortals should occasionally experience intemperate seasons, that just and good God in communicating to our being reason and intelligence, has, by these blessings, furnished us with the means of preserving our existence, and of passing the stream of life in the midst of rocks and of dangers. In making use of our reason and of our intelligence, we may then fulfil the

intention of nature, in obviating the effects of the calamities which afflict our globe.

But is it really ascertained, gentlemen, that we have experienced an actual scarcity, and that this intemperance of the season has taken back from us the pledge of our existence ? Has God been very evil towards us ?

Our harvests have not produced abundance ; in their train they have left *a necessary supply*. now man lives by this *necessary supply*. But, if events easy to foresee, and not foreseen, or if foreign causes deprive man of his *necessary support*, he supplies them by reason and intelligence. By the aid of reason and intelligence, governments ought to manage for the body politic as man manages for himself. If a domestic animal had purloined your dinner, would you confine yourself to deplored this little accident ? Would you not find the means of replacing it to satisfy your appetite, and the cravings of your stomach ? Be assuredly convinced that France found a necessary supply in the harvest of 1816. I offer as a proof of it the abundance of grain brought into a great number of markets, *and the foreign exportations*. These *exportations* have diminished our proper stores, that is to say, the *necessary supply*. The ability and intelligence of administration have not caused to reflow into the markets of some of the less happily situated departments, the super-abundance of certain others. Jobbing, rapacity, speculations on the public distress, have not been arrested in their origin. The circulation has not been provoked : now, in principle, from the default of *circulation* springs *privation* : a fictitious scarcity produces the same results as a real scarcity.

In 1812, a fictitious scarcity was experienced, caused by monopolies, and the default of circulation. Bread, as in 1817, fetched an excessive price ; indigent people were seen ; one sees them at all times ; the misery did not become public,

because the activity of commerce and of manufactures furnished salaries to the workmen and to the artizan; gains to the commercial classes, and rents to the landholders. The artizan and the workman could not procure themselves superfluities, but they had *necessaries*. If, at this time, *the markets had been as well supplied as in 1817*, notwithstanding the dearness, we might still have beheld fewer miserable persons, because the people received wages, *of which it is at this day deprived*.

Our commerce and our manufactures are greatly decayed. Their activity is not to be compared to that of 1812. The people experienced then a scarcity of the means for consumption: it had the power of obtaining necessities. Now *it experiences the same lack, it has not the same power*.

In reasoning logically and by inference, I conclude, First, that we have not experienced real scarcity, and not even factitious scarcity in many of the departments where abundance existed; *seeing that with money every one resident in them procured himself necessities*. Secondly, that it is money, wages, in a word, the means of existence that fail. Thirdly, that the intemperance of the seasons is foreign to the public misery.

It is falsely they assert that the new harvest will remove the misery; it will not give employment during many months, but to some labouring husbandmen. I had an intimate conviction, that after the month of August the grain would be still dearer, although very abundant: my presentiments have not deceived me. I venture to predict, that bread will be sold at a very high price the approaching year. Since the intemperance of the seasons, according to our prophets, was the cause of public misery; since the abundance of the new harvest ought to repair the disasters attributed to the precedent one, wherefore then *is the misery the same*, this *supposed cause no longer existing*; for a real abundance has succeeded

a pretended scarcity? How do you resolve these important questions? I am going to resolve them.

The public misery, as I have demonstrated, not being the effect of the bad harvest of 1816: the good harvest of 1817 will not be a cause that will destroy an effect produced by another cause. In principle, to create by a new cause, a new effect, we must destroy the former cause which produced the former effect; otherwise the former effect will become a new cause which will paralyse the new effect. When one is discussing the great interests of a nation it is indispensable to reason from consequences, in order not to compromise its safety and security. This is what our administration does not do.

In February, 1816, we could not at the time foresee what the new harvest would be. Recollect, notwithstanding that the misery increased daily, that we remarked in the departments agitations pointed out in the bosom of your assembly, and attributed to the lukewarmness of magistrates.

From this period (six months before the inclement season) the source of our misfortunes sensibly became swollen: it flows now; receiving waters from all parts, it forms a torrent which threatens to sweep away every thing. *I forewarned you of it last November; you did not deign to pay attention to my reflections: you were deaf, dumb, and blind from your birth; in November, you were born as representatives.*

Christians, in the prayers which we daily address to the Eternal, we thus express ourselves: *give us this day our daily bread, and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.*

The christian people pray, then, to the supreme being, to send them *their daily bread, to deliver them from evil, and to remove from them the temptation to commit it.*

It is but by the intermediate help of governments, instituted to promote the welfare of the people, and not to oppress them.

that God sends to men united in society, their *daily bread*, that they may be delivered from evil, and not led into temptation.

If these precepts of the gospel, at the time when one often pronounces the words of religion, had been put in practice; if the principles of policy had been applied, citizens who became criminal by *temptation*, would have found in labour their *means of existence, the daily bread* of their families. Engaged in their daily occupations, deaf to the evil counsels of instigators, those criminals whom we have visited with an infamous punishment, would have attained the ordinary term of life, in the condition of honest citizens, and good fathers of a family.*

Full of humanity towards artizans, Phocion says to Aritias, let the government, which cannot make shift without them, govern without despising them. The magistrate ought to take care that labour furnishes them a certain and abundant nourish-

* We read in the *Journal de Paris* of the 9th of September, the following article, under the head of *Anvers*.

"The persons accused in the affair of the 25th of June last, who have been called this day before the court of assizes, are fourteen in number; three men, and eleven women, almost *all mothers of a family*. In beholding these *citizens*, whom *hunger* and the speculations in grain have conducted to the bar reserved for crime, one cannot hinder the indulgence of a wish, that the issue of the trial may be favourable to them, and we hope that we shall soon have the satisfaction of announcing their acquittal. Many considerations militate in their favour; want of work, the contagious example of other towns; and to sum up all, *hunger*, to which these individuals were a prey, for we cannot dissemble it to ourselves, that, in spite of the solicitude of *authority*, seconded by the philanthropy of the wealthier inhabitants of this city, *many wretched poor are totally destitute*."

ment, or they will become enemies of the government, as the Ilottes were of the Spartans, and they will have to reproach themselves with *a moiety of their crimes, the very chastisement with which they would essay to punish them.*

Ought you to be astonished, gentlemen, to see individuals of the lower class of the people, subject to the empire of the passions, when one sees at all times ministers selling for gold the security of their fellow-citizens, magistrates selling justice, representatives selling their oaths, the rich selling their probity? And one would wish that men, without the first rudiments of education, often in want of necessaries, should serve for models of conduct, be inaccessible to the attacks of the passions, insensible to the allurements which hope of a better condition presents to them, and that they should give an example to those who ought to shew it to them, in pointing out the duties of the social man! What folly!

When one sees representatives holding their tongues to preserve their places, when the great interests of the state demand that they should speak, one would have miserable wretches shut their ears to the counsels of personal interest; one would have them behold, without experiencing a sentiment of emotion or of grief, or the admittance of rage, of phrenzy, or of despair, their young children, whose dying eyelids seem to reproach them for the blessings of existence.

When one enjoys the superfluities of life, it is easy to view the wretched through the end of the glass that removes objects to a distance. When one does not see misery with its appalling train, one does not picture it but in miniature,—salaries of passion are crimes. *Remove then from men the occasions to commit faults,—you will see fewer guilty and criminals.*

If we throw a glance over the operations of the police since the fall of the republican system, we shall be tempted

to believe that the citizens who fulfil the most important functions in the state, make it a glory, and regard it as an honor, to proclaim a complete ignorance of the first elements of the science of government, of a science without the knowledge of which administration treads the political labyrinth without a guide, and in which it continually wanders about without hope of extricating itself.

Under a well constituted government, whose actions are established upon sure principles, the police is the auxiliary of the civil and judicial administration. Its exercise is so much the more extended or contracted, according as the civil, economical, and financial administration is more or less corrupt, according as it respects the general and partial interests of political society, as it removes from the citizens the occasions of committing faults, the temptations of becoming culpable. The police, then, without losing its activity or its inspection, loses more or less of its proper action.

The police, which I consider as *the torch-bearer of judicial power*, discovers to the latter guilty persons, and delivers them into the hands of justice. Here are found its limits and its attributes,—an accuser cannot, in fact, become a judge,—a party in, or an usurper of, the judicial attributes.

The police should arrest plots *from their birth*; far from suffering them to form themselves under its eye. Then every man who would be tempted to conspire or to trouble the public repose, intimidated by the conviction that he had acquired of the vigilance of the police, would fear that he should be unable to escape the observing and penetrating eye of this new Argus; he would tremble to disclose his designs, he would apprehend finding a false brother, an informer in a confidant; he would hold his tongue, and would not act,—a simple hint from the police that should announce to an individual that it suspects or is aware of his designs, would not

this suffice to annihilate the plan of a conspiracy ? If citizens, on the contrary, have time to prepare the execution of a criminal project, to brew a treacherous design ; if no obstacle stops them, they are on that account more bold ; their increasing success, the persuasion that they are in no danger of discovery, offers its allurements, its temptations, to other individuals who believe they are initiating themselves in a profound secret. *The number of the guilty increases with the number of accomplices* initiated by temptation ; if they are not enabled successfully to figure on the scene of error, their example is nevertheless dangerous : others, more rash, attribute the defeat not to the vigilance of administration, but to the force of which the governing power has the distribution. New projects are meditated ; new plots are formed ; new criminals are conducted to punishment, who have become guilty by temptation, or because the inexperience of the administration concealing from it just principles, has not removed the occasions of committing faults and crimes.

The police of a good government ought to protect the weak against the strong ; to guarantee the property of persons and effects against the attacks of rapaciousness and criminal passions.

The police ought to fulfil the sacred object of its institution amongst a polished people. Vigilant, active, foreseeing, it is *the protectress of the rights and of the liberties* of all the citizens. The French police exercises its authority in an inverse sense : oppressive and tyrannical, one has seen it, during a great number of years, offer temptations, far from removing them.

The interior administration wanders from its end ; the police wandering with it, separates itself from its object ; both are going the wrong way ; policy is no more to them than an Egyptian hieroglyphic, the true meaning of which they can-

not dive into, and which they interpret at hazard. To remedy the consequences which result from their errors and their faults, they commit new errors and new faults ; they stray more and more into the labyrinth. To conceal these blunders, the fundamental laws are abridged. What results from it ? *The citizens are the innocent victims* of the extravagance and of the ignorance of administration, who, believing itself omniscient, disdains to instruct itself, and raises up enemies to that government of which it pretends to be the devoted friend. What devotion ! What policy ! What moral theory !

The looker on, who is a witness to these disorders, these enormities, sighing, exclaims, " Oh France ! oh my country ! do we live in the nineteenth century, the age of knowledge ? Are you indeed inhabited by a civilized people ? Are not your children still barbarous and stupid Gauls ?

It was easy to hearten the state shaken by political convulsions. The police, the economical and financial administration, have prolonged these shocks by spreading the poison through the veins of the social body.

If, amidst the sufferings caused by this poison, we arrive at the term of our dependence, that is to say, at the moment of our independence, we shall be so exhausted, that it will be difficult to remedy our ruined constitution. *The errors of a day are scarcely repaired in a century.* Be assured, gentlemen, of this truth in recurring to the primitive causes of our revolution, to those causes which preceded, during three centuries, the fall of the Roman empire.

It is alone by taking for our guides the first principles of policy, reason, and equity, that we attain to the sound administration of a state, and not by feeling about in the dark, and by following an uncertain and versatile march. Representatives, you are asleep ; rouse yourselves, rouse yourselves ! An unhappy people is in a broken slumber. Ward off the

waking of this people; experience tells you it is always terrible. Indigence and misery lead to corruption of manners: children are born and brought up in the bosom of depravity: it is amidst these disorders that religion is spoken of, when virtue submits under the blows which vice, the child of indigence and of indolence, lays upon her. Oh governments! how blind you are!

Missionaries are traversing certain Southern departments, to preach the evangelical morality: are these departments inhabited by Cochin Chinese?

Corrosives are more forcible than anodines. When a body politic is acted upon by corrosives, antidotes do not come into play, the corrosive power being permanent. When to the first dose of poison the course of events adds a fresh one, the effect of the successive application of the antidote is destroyed by the effect of the successive application of the corrosive. Like the daughters of Danaus, we pour water into a cask whose bottom is full of holes. Now the ravages caused in the social body by the presence of corrosives, having for their agents political scourges, destroy the agents; we suppress the action.

The action once destroyed, exhortations will form the applications, the exterior remedies, by means of which we shall outwardly cicatrice wounds internally healed. A good legislation, an administration wise and enlightened, will conduct us to a state of safety.

You will, doubtless, observe to me, that one applies ineffectual remedies, because one does not know better ones. You are at the point where I wait for you.

Our evils are either curable or incurable. If they are incurable, let us consider ourselves as condemned, to witness our own dissolution by fatigues, by exhaustion, and by convulsions. But every malady is derived from some first cause; it is curable before it becomes incurable. We ought then to regret the progress of that which oppressed us, a progress

which good remedies, primitively applied, would have stopped at the outset ; for a sick man, skilfully treated, regains health ; an unskilful physician might have conducted him to the tomb. The presence of disease points out the existence of a remedy, *sublata causa tollitur effectus.*

If you agree, gentlemen, that we have employed, *for want of better ones*, remedies without efficacy,—which, by opening our always bleeding wounds aggravate our sufferings,—*why do you unthinkingly approve of them ?*

Representatives are, or ought to be, by their essence, friends of the country and of mankind : it is their duty to devote their labours to the public good, the object of their commission, and to bring to the tribune the tribute of their information and of their meditations.

In opposition to this, you will again present me, I divine your thoughts, another prejudice : I will combat it with the victorious arms of reason and impartiality. We ought, you will tell me, to follow the constitutional line : to act otherwise would be to encroach upon the initiative sovereignty.

You profess a false principle. Without the right of rejection or modification, there is no deliberation. If you enjoyed only the privilege of approving or improving, of considering the project of a law solely in its whole extent, would the end be attained, seeing that the depositaries of the executive power not being exempt from error, every project of a law cannot be susceptible of execution, but by the enjoyment of the right of modification ?

Sound sense and reason placing no limit to this right, from thence results the power of modifying each article. But from this *extended* modification springs the power of renewal ; this *renewal* becomes *initiative.*

Will any one tell me that we should fear lest the legislative power usurp the executive power ? It is wrong. The deliberations of democracy are submitted to a council of revision,

before they acquire the force of a law; and is not, after the letter of our constitution, the sovereign authority necessary?

Every proposition of a law is presented with a view to the social interest! Oh! who could better discuss, execute, ameliorate the laws, proposed for the interest of all, in the name of the Supreme Administrator, than the *active* interests of the political administration, founded on the powers of the *passive* interests?

The erroneous principle which I have just attacked, has been appealed to by the minority in 1815. The ministerial party reproached the majority with assuming the initiative power, when it rejected the new indirect duties on oil, cards, soap, and tissues, to replace them by divers temporary imposts. In 1816, the reporter of the commission on the budget told you, "The commission has had a double danger to avoid; the difficulty of adhering to the plan of finance proposed, and the fear of substituting its own proposition for that of the king's.

"It has taken a course between these two extremes, its proposition is the result of conferences which it has had with the ministers; it did not conceive that it was qualified to encroach upon the authority of the king."

If ministers had persisted in their resolution, the commission then would have confined itself to approve of, or to improve upon, the totality of the projected budget.

You will appreciate at their just value, gentlemen, the fatal consequences which a respect for similar prejudices would involve. If ministers persisted in presenting a bad plan of finance, which, by paralysing industry and commerce, would be subversive of the public prosperity, the representatives, conquered by their prejudices, would limit themselves then to approve or to reject. Consequently they would not improve,—we should then be deprived of a plan of finance: the

government would find itself under an impossibility of raising the taxes; the people would refuse to obey unlawful demands, not rendered valid by the legislative power; the public treasuries would be void. What would become of a government without taxes?

I have remarked an evident contradiction in the sense of some passages of two reports, made in the name of the commission. The right of *voting by free will*, a tax, says the first reporter, is the most important of our attributes; it is that part of our power which gives the greatest force to our liberties; it is as ancient in France as the monarchy, and as the organized state of society. Established by our ancient institutions, the charter has consecrated it anew. Does this right consist only in voting a tax, or in refusing it? Does it not also convey the right of *verifying, of watching over*, and of *fixing* the appropriation of that tax. The chamber of representatives would be otherwise merely an instrument, which would arbitrarily refuse or grant a tax without considering the wants of the state. Thus your commission has considered that the examination of the disbursements and of the accounts of ministers, was its first duty; that it could not propose a tax to you until it was instructed as to the appropriation of those which it had first granted; and it is to render this principle sacred, that it has determined that it would make you two reports; the first upon the *disbursements* and the *necessities*, the second, upon the *ways and means* to supply them.

The government apprises us of the sum which is required to meet the expenses of the general administration of the state. The representatives exercising the imprescriptible right of *watching over* and *examining* the disbursements and the accounts of ministers, from thence results the right of modification. If all parts of the disbursements are not specified, a deliberative assembly would only accord the faculty of exacting the sum deemed necessary and detailed.

The commission on the budget has justly then rendered sacred, and recognised as a primary cause, the right *of examination, the verification of the disbursements*; that is to say, the right *of modifying the disbursements*. It will be easy, gentlemen, to make you partake in the conviction which I have acquired, that the right of *verifying, of watching over, and of fixing* the appropriation of the revenue, being recognized as a first principle, the right of *regulating the ways and means to supply it*, ought equally to be recognised and made sacred.

Taxation does not form a *unity*, but a *system*; consequently a re-union or a coherence of many taxes of divers natures. From the right of *verifying, of examining, and of fixing*, the elements which constitute the disbursements, arises by analogy the right of *verifying, discussing, and fixing* the elements which compose the sum total of the receipts.

Government has the *power* of pointing out, but not (we are not deceiving ourselves on this point) the *right of specifying and determining* what sources ought to produce the receipts. A deliberative assembly re-uniting itself to deliberate on any subject, the depositaries of the executive power, the delegated permanent administrators, *prepare the work*: it is upon this *preparatory work*, named the *project of a law*, that the representatives, whose mission is temporary, deliberate if there is cause to *grant, to refuse, or to modify*.

The right of voting a tax, a privilege of the national representatives, becomes then, in their hands, a sacred inalienable unperishable right of causing the sources of the taxes, which produce the receipts to spring forth.

If the government arrogated the right of saying, *I will have* the receipts which are necessary for me, provided by such or such a duty the citizens *would by no means arrogate a right*, but *they would enjoy their rights*, in replying by the organ of their representatives, *We do not choose it*. We engage for the payment of a stipulated sum; we will pay it according to

the conditions stipulated in your guarantee, the legislative obligation. You hold in your hands the executive power, and the coercive force ; set to work, open your treasuries, cause the *obligation* of distressing to be put in force. Have you not an hypothesis armed against the landed and personal estates ? Your receipts are *certain and determined* : what more would you have ?

The conduct of the chamber of 1815 has been more political then, and more conformable to just principles, than that of 1816, when it opposed the application of an additional system of duties ; the radical vice of which the minister has recognized, in dispensing with the reproduction of it the succeeding year, preserving nevertheless the duty on *oils*.

This duty is become the object of numerous protests, in the name, and for the interests of, the departments which furnish this liquid. It bears no affinity to the institutions of a representative government, under which all the citizens, equal in rights, pay *equally*, and in proportion to their respective means, their share in the general contributions.

The duty upon oil is paid by a certain number of individuals, and is not by the other citizens. In some departments oil is of the first necessity, and in others it is a superfluity ; it is necessary to *divers* species of manufactures, and this duty bears upon industry.

To all these protests they have replied (in the sitting of the 22d February) : "When the question has been on landed contributions, you have heard these walls re-echo the *lamentations* of the proprietors ; commerce and industry have made their complaints to you, when the question has been respecting *patents*. A combat has just been entered into before you against cautionary acquittals by the law relative to circulation. The public functionaries have sustained another combat against the persons interested in the right of selling by retail. *The East and*

the South remonstrate. You have just been told that the culture of vines was almost annihilated. And yet you cannot redress so many calamities without *leaving the public treasury void*, at the moment when there is occasion for so many funds. It is absurd to lend an ear to this bombast, which appears to have the interest of the people for its base. The Athenians had determined by a law, that the first person who should touch two thousand talents, deposited in the temple of Minerva, should be punished with death. After the loss of two naval battles, the law was revoked, and no one doubted that necessity was a superior law to that which had been enacted in happier times. It is for *the safety of the state, for the safety of the people*, that the commission, *braving unpopularity*, proposes to you an indispensable contribution."

It would be impossible to make me comprehend how protests, presented for *the interest of the citizens*, are in opposition to the *safety of the people*. The more commerce is confined, and industry paralyzed, the more also we shall see all the causes which destroy the effect of the means of safety, come to pass.

These fine maxims have by no means conducted France towards a state of amelioration; and it is proved, I cannot too often repeat it, not by paradoxical reasonings, but by the evidence of facts, that her situation becomes more critical each year. (and even each month). Is it in draining all the sources of prosperity that one is to arrive at prosperity? Is it in tearing open wounds, in irritating them, that one is to effect curing and cicatrising them? Can one and the same cause produce two different and opposite effects? Yes, gentlemen, if reason did not demonstrate the falsehood of these dangerous maxims, undeniable facts would demonstrate them to us.

The comparison of the revocation of the Athenian law with our position, is in nothing exact; it would not be so, but in

that case alone which one could put to you: our temples contain treasures equal to the chapel of the holy Madona of Loretto; our public edifices are decorated with ornaments of gold and silver; we have preserved these precious metals which were useless to us in happier times; but necessity, the safety of the people, requires us to make use of them: *sagis populi suprema lex esto.*

Do not confound the situation of a nation which uses the precious metals hid in its temples and in its monuments, with that of a nation, whose territorial funds, whose commerce, and whose industry, are not *actual riches*, but *the means of riches*, which, put in action by labour, with the aid of capitals, become *riches*.

Without capitals, a land remains uncultivated, and without value, commerce and industry are inactive; without cultivation, without commerce, without industry, a people perish by famine. We already perceive this sad perspective—cultivation, commerce, and industry, being *the means of riches*, the sources of *taxation*, their activity will be a cause of which the profits will be the effect. The profits furnish rents to the landed proprietor, wages to the artizan, returns to the merchant, and to the manufacturer. Rents, wages, returns, present, without exception, to every class of society, *the means of existence*, and *the means of taxation*.

If you do not make good the cause which ought to produce the effect, if you do not maintain the source of profits, you will be walking blindfold, you will do nothing for your fellow citizens. In speaking of *the people*, of *misery*, of *prosperity*, you will only be uttering empty words. Then no more means of existence, no more means of taxation, and we shall continue to exhaust ourselves. You will demand taxes, you will be answered by tears; the treasury will be furnished by sums, which, in going out of the purse of each citizen, will

not be replaced there by new profits. Doubtless, gentlemen, you are not ignorant that the accumulation of profits forms capital.

In persisting in the establishment of the cause which occasions the *lamentations* of the landed interests, the *complaints* of commerce and of industry, you will swell these lamentations and these complaints ; these lamentations, these complaints, will soon change into the frightful cries sent forth by despair : you will understand the **CRUES OF THE PEOPLE.**

Do not you perceive, with affright, the diminution of national capital ? (do not confound this capital with the monied circulation, which is but a portion of it.) A considerable quantity of commercial men and of landed proprietors attack the circulating capital, or the capital represented by the value of land. The tenant sees his profits diminish by deficiencies, by the surcharge of contributions, or the high price of provisions. The poor man is without wages. The effective capital diminishes. First, in replacing the customary profits, which alone, in fundamental first principles, ought to furnish the means of existence ; secondly, in not compensating for its losses by the aid of new profits.

In 1815, France was not in a desperate situation. The unskilfulness of administration has alone aggravated our evils in lieu of solacing us. The false *exterior* policy of Louis XVII, in conjunction with the politics of his time, and the inconsidereate wars which he had to sustain, opposed real obstacles to the developement of the public prosperity : yet a wise administration surmounted the obstacles : the taxes were modified or diminished ; *the people lived comfortably.*

Notwithstanding our extraordinary charges and occupation by foreigners, a good administration might have been able, *each year and progressively*, to conduct France towards its prosperity.

No sophistry; let us reason from consequences; let us reduce the question to its simplest bearing. France should have about two billions, five hundred million of francs; this capital represented the debt to the allies, and that to the creditors of the state. The permanent debt, and annuities not being payable at demand, there remains but about thirteen hundred millions, or something more, to pay. A sum of five hundred and some odd millions should cover each year the ordinary expences, a sum that approaches to our expenditure at the era of the revolution. At this time all the citizens did not contribute to the public charges.

Add our national capital, which (as I have remarked) daily diminishes to our immense landed property, susceptible under a good administration of receiving a great extention, and you will know our resources; you will convince yourselves that a demandable debt of about thirteen hundred millions, and an available revenue offive hundred millions towards the state, are not in proportion to our riches; that we do not owe the *thirtieth part* of our public property. England, which they are so much pleased to cite, has a debt *equivalent* to its landed and personal property: we resemble then a rich landholder, who directing his affairs badly, entangles them, clogs himself, borrows on his capital to live, and finishes by ruining himself.

Having a similar picture before your eyes, will you continue to follow the vicious systems, which, practised up to this day, perpetuates our sufferings? Is it not time at last to change the route? Will you exact proofs more conclusive than those presented by the evidence of facts to determine to do so?

* In my *Medicine Politique*, I have rapidly sketched a picture of the situation of France, at the period when Sully was minister: this situation and our own have no essential difference, but in respect to the occupation of the territory by foreigners. The result of Sully's administration is known: our ministers have moved in a contrary sense.

A people well directed pays with one hand, it receives and replaces with the other; *its purse is always full, and the public treasury is never empty.*

Instead of incessantly talking of the wants of the Treasury, and of opposing them as arguments to the complaints of the people, would it not be more politic, more zealous, more prudent, to occupy ourselves perseveringly in the care of *making the wants of the treasury coincide with the wants of the people?*

Do you think that these wants are incompatible? This principle of incompatibility would lead to the dissolution of political society. To adopt it would be to run counter to natural order. A wise government knits its bonds closer, instead of disuniting them.

The system of modification ought then to replace with you the false system of approbation, and disapprobation. Observation, approbation, and disapprobation, are indeed the result of judgment; judgment is the consequence of reflection. Meditation is a combination of an infinity of reflections; from the opposition of reflections the light springs; the human mind, in following its natural track, proceeds from the known to the search of the unknown: *labor omnia vincit improbus.*

Do you think, gentlemen, that if each representative arrived from his department with ideas either borrowed from it, or gathered by his own solicitude; that if he brought forward the fruit of his meditations, there would not result from it numerous modifications which, if introduced into these confused systems, if proposed and acted upon, might procure salutary ameliorations to our unhappy lot.*

Observe that in your assembly one is confined to sustaining discussions which have not produced any satisfactory result. The two extreme points of the vast field of discussion have

* See the note A.

been occupied, and the middle of it has been left void: it is in the centre that you should construct the arch of alliance to place there our palladium.

If a good constitution is the palladium of a nation; if the hallowed respect one bears it is the guarantee of its happy destiny, and of its future felicity, one may also with reason regard the national representation as the guard posted to watch over its preservation. The constitution is the sacred fire of the nation: woe to the people who see it extinguished!

Under the imperial government the immeasurable ambition of a single man put France within a finger's breadth of its ruin. The turpitude and the baseness of the national representation were the primitive causes which gave birth to the effect which is become the secondary cause of our catastrophe. We have experienced the impression of the imbecile efforts of an impotent representation, a dying monster to whom, in his iron, there now remained but a slight breath of life.

France will never be happy so long as she beholds figuring in the sanctuary of the law's automaton machines, which will execute all the false movements that shall be communicated to them. Men, in making use of the reason and of the intelligence which they have received from the creator, perceive that they have a soul, a conscience, and a heart. The soul upraises itself to the eminence of grand events; the conscience makes the voice of humanity to be heard; and the heart beats for our country: the senses are put in action; the eyes look on the suffering being; the ears are struck by the groans of misfortune, they listen to *the cry of the people*. The mouth expresses the desire of the nation: the hands turn over the leaves of books and of manuscripts, to discover in them the ideas which the mind gathers, which the judgment combines, in order to offer a nomenclature of remedies which may be antidotes to the poison.

Our charter consecrates the right of petition, the most powerful arm which one can oppose to the united efforts of arbitrary power, of iniquity, and of oppression; this right protects the individual liberty and property.

It is before a *dozen representatives* that, in order to comply with forms, and follow the established rules, your commission makes its report after the reading of a *procès verbal*. The representatives of the departments in which the petitioner resides are rarely present. Would it not be more expedient to make this *important communication* towards the close of the sitting, *in presence of all*?

The commission not having always the necessary documents to render justice to the protest, passes to the order of the day, or returns it to the proper minister. Do not let us confound the minister, *and the office of the minister*. The subjects often remonstrate to the chamber, after having fruitlessly remonstrated to the local administration, and subsequently to the minister. From this return there results a second remonstrance. If some *private* or official interest, or some powerful recommendations (of which we have too many examples), have rendered the first petition abortive, the second will experience the same reception, and will remain unanswered in the archives.

Under the empire of a wise liberty, the right of petition is in full vigour, for the purpose of destroying abuses of every description, of remedying the inconveniences of local animosities. Does this right of petition, the protector of the liberties and of the people, exist in all its plenitude, in all its force? No. We have then, *in fact and against right*, but the phantom of a charter, but the phantom of a representation. It is not in the charter, nor in the swallowing up or the exhaustion of the exchequer, that the safety of France, the perpetuity of a confirmed happiness, the public prosperity will be found.

The guarantee of our liberties will alone be offered in a rational representation wisely composed, the members of which shall be *men* penetrated with a sense of their duties, identified with the nature of their rights. No *real* representation; no safety.

Let us offer the nation then a sound representation. At its presence phantoms will disappear: reality will take the place of a disastrous illusion: the immense population that covers the French soil will perceive upon the altar of their country, its palladium: the national representation will transport it to the temple of Minerva, to preserve it there eternally: we shall be happy.

Representatives, you re-unite yourselves within these walls *according to usage*; shall we this year behold you according to usage, enslaved by prejudices, guided by routine? Do not confound usage and duty, for the representatives have contracted the usage of going out of the path of their duty. *The past ought to serve as a warning, and not as a model.* A past error is repaired by a present good action, the favourable consequence of which is met with in *the future*.

As competitors for the re-establishment of peace and concord, will you cast into your assembly the apples of discord? Will you divide France into the people of the south and the people of the north? Will you distinguish the right side from the left side? Shall we still hear the mention of the words *majority* and *minority*? Will you uphold as a sacred first principle, that the government and the people should enter the lists? Will the family council of the French nation present the draught of the plan of a campaign? Will it command the left wing in the war of sovereigns against their people, if fathers, against their children? Is it by keeping alive the heat of division and of sedition that the citizens are interested in the preservation of their government?

What will you do? what will this year produce? New laws of restriction on the liberty of the subject will probably be proposed to you. You will be told that the want of union obliges their execution, although they everlastingly tell you of re-union and of good understanding. Will you not reply, that these laws of restriction, deemed so wise and so indispensable for these last two years, have furnished results altogether different from those which it was hoped we should obtain; that they have been presented by those in the interest of the government, *against* the government; that you cannot anew swerve from fundamental laws, to remedy the defects of official ignorance, which has taken cause for effect, and effect for cause, that you cannot adopt measures reprobated *by the consequences of their first execution*?

If they unadvisedly repeat to you, that of all the remedies which a free state can recur to in difficult times, that which the experience of a neighbouring nation has demonstrated to be the least dangerous to the public liberty, the least susceptible of degenerating into tyranny, is, without contradiction, *the suspension of the judicial forms* which protect individual liberty, how will you determine? Will you suffer yourselves to be seduced by these sophisms?

Will you not say with me, that it is absurd to adopt with such want of reflection a dangerous system of imitation, the consequences of which are so fatal to the repose of the citizens? The motives which amongst our neighbours and amongst ourselves have demanded the suspension of judicial forms, are only the effects derived from two different causes, which result from one primitive cause.

You must observe, that it is more than a century since the termination of the English revolution: that the new dynasty has found means to seat itself firmly on the throne: that this neighbouring people, surrounded by the ocean, out of the

reach of other nations, has undertaken every thing; has dared every thing: that no events interior or exterior have justified the suspension of the *habeas corpus*. In France they have found a justification of this suspension in event and their consequences, in the commotions produced by the changes of government.

In England all the citizens are animated by national spirit: in France there exists a spirit of disunion. From whence then arises this difference in the situation of these two nations? On what account does one nevertheless remark an exact similitude in the acts of their government? The *habeas corpus* has not been suspended, but because Great Britain is badly governed. A good and wise administration in France might have arrested the fermentation of spirits, it might have effected re-union.*

You will, I imagine, be presented with the famous financial system of 1816, *the application of which has brought no remedy to our evils*, as a system of permanent and perpetual foundation. You will not fail to pay attention to articles of consumption, the augmentation of which will be progressive, notwithstanding the abundance of the harvests. I predict to you that the dearness of provisions will be general, continually increasing, and that the French will shortly be obliged for economy to make frequent journeys into foreign countries.

They will boast to you in high terms of the creating of revenues: they will attempt to dazzle you by the rise experienced in the public securities, but they will not tell you that this rise was the fruit of jobbing; that a government which creates revenues, is interested as well as its creditors in dealing at the highest interest, in order to diminish its losses;

* From 1799 to 1803, the price of provisions in England has increased in the proportion of five to three.

that the public funds are kept up, because capitalists finding no employment for their money in mercantile operations or other undertakings, have speculated in the funds, calculating on the secret practices of the agents of government to support them: that if this burdensome and dangerous system of the funds met with a fall, the government would exert its influence on their depression, to purchase again at a better composition: that this jobbing on the rise and fall of the funds is immoral: that it compromises the fortunes of individuals: that it is in opposition with just principles; but that we shall always act thus, by continuing to imitate a nation void of scruples, void of principle.

It will be repeated to you, "what prejudice would combat the existence of public spirit in France? The recovery of the contributions deposes to the contrary: in each contributor it attests a good Frenchman." But they will refrain from telling you "that the payment is effected by force, that refusal would be followed by a distress."

Let them actually say to all the contributors, "the government leaves itself to your attachment: it renounces coercive measures: you shall witness neither a distraint nor satellites of the treasury." I maintain that nine-tenths of the contributors would not pay. What public spirit!

They will place before your eyes the wants of the treasury: you will talk of economy; some will approve the famous new furnished system of the last century; others proscribe it. They will not tell you, that the times are changed, that our institutions are no more the same, and that such a system, excusable under an absolute monarchy, is not so under a representative government.

They will economise one or two millions, when by prudent meditation, you might discover more important retrenchments. Avoid the enormous costs of negotiations, which figure

on the budgets for twelve or fifteen millions: diminish from fifteen to twenty per cent. the enormous profits of contractors; diminish the charges for fees of office; you will again obtain forty or fifty millions. Here are actual retrenchments.

Consider the entirely new theory of a nominal currency; you will infallibly discover in it a retrenchment of some hundreds of millions every year, a loss occasioned by a counter-action of all the parts which constitute our vicious system of finances, which was, with the system of loans, an active agent in our political catastrophies. Would the government renew the fatal results of 1789? I cannot believe it: yet it moves by large strides on the road which conducts thither. The past serves as a model to us, when sound policy presents the past as a *warning for the future.**

Twenty or thirty episcopal sees have been established, which will necessarily require an annual disbursement of more than a million: with this million we could furnish a pastor to five hundred parishes that are without one. We have bishops enough. Certain departments petition for priests: bishops are sent to them. It is publicly notorious, and I am stating no calumny, that many villages are destitute of priests; they are refused to them: this refusal is the result of the abuses introduced into the religious hierarchy, as into the civil hierarchy. How are we to explain these mysteries? At the moment when they are talking of again raising up altars, they do nothing to raise up those whose restoration is demanded by pious people; the churches that were shut are not opened. What fantastical conduct!

“ Je ne puis qu'annoncer de dures vérités :

“ Qui ne sert que son Dieu n'en a point d'autre à dire :

* See note B.

“ Je vous parle en son nom, comme au nom de l’empire.

“ Vous etes aveugles ; je dois vous décoverrir

“ Le crime ou les dangers ou vous voulez courir.”

Voltaire.

“ Unwelcome truths, ‘tis such alone I tell :

“ Nor would I, but our God has none beside ;

“ ‘Tis in his name, as in our empire’s name,

“ I speak. Blind are you all ; and I must needs

“ Unveil the crime the dangers that you seek.”

It is difficult to conceive the apathy of government ; the infatuation and obstinacy of our ministers, who most sensibly conduct us to our ruin, by promising us prodigies, by telling us of liberation, of a happy future, of the activity of commerce and of industry, which, far from reality, exist but in the paintings of their imagination.

“ Cet avenir cachus, si loin de notre vue,

“ Nous console bein pue quand le present nous teu.” *

“ This close veiled future, far removed from sight,

“ Is cheerless, when the present points to death.”

If our ministers are deficient in information, why do they disdain to enlighten themselves.† If they were statesmen,

* Voltaire’s *Don Pedro*.

† “ The charter subjects ministers to responsibility ; but if one cannot cite them before the law, except for enormous crimes ; if they are not amenable to it, either for their *errors*, or even their *injustice* ; is there not a rigorous necessity that one should at least publicly point out this injustice, and these errors, to the wisdom of the monarch, to the solicitude of the great bodies of the state, to the judgment of opinion ? ”

Report of the Commission of the Chamber of Representatives on the Liberty of the Press. (1814)

we should continually approach the term of our misfortunes, towards which we should be progressively marching, to arrive at it at the moment when once freed of our extraordinary charges, we shall obtain our national independence.

The statesman surmounts obstacles, when the happiness of the country demands it: *he raises himself, if he is obliged to do it, above his age*: our ministers are constantly below it. Our ministers, our political seamen, know nothing of seamanship. It is a harder task to row with a heavy swell than on a smooth sea. Such a mariner as could conduct the Paris packet to St. Cloud, would find himself embarrassed if employed in the navigation of the Channel, or of the ocean.

“Tell brille au second rang qui s’eclipse au premier.”

“Such shine in second rank, in first eclipsed.”

Our ministers are men of education; they know a vast many things; they are only ignorant of what they ought to know—the science of government. Universal science is not innate in man: with much erudition, talents, varied acquirements, distinguished qualities, even with many virtues, one may yet make a bad minister.

A poet will be but a sorry rhymier.

“Si son astre en naissant ne l’a cree poete,
“S’il n’a reçu du ciel l’influence secrete.”

“If on his birth the muses have not smil’d,
“If heav’ly fires ne’er sparkle in his breast.”

The stars of ministers have not created them all ministers; it is often found that they have not received from heaven that secret influence, which promotes the happiness and the prosperity of nations, while their errors exercise but too sensible an influence on the misery of the people.

Chances elevate ministers: but the destinies of the people oppose themselves often to the continuance of this good fortune. The burden with which the paltry self-love of our ministers would load them is too heavy, much too heavy for them.

A citizen, on being made minister, ought to be penetrated with all the extent of the new duties which his dignity imposes on him, for be it voluntarily, or be it involuntarily, he may do a great deal of good or a great deal of harm. In taking on himself an official situation, he takes an engagement to be useful to his native land, and to remedy the evils of his country. If he cannot attain this end, a *secret voice* tells him, *withdraw yourself; your efforts are nugatory; you wish to do good, you are doing harm; withdraw yourself.*

But ministers feign not to hear this secret voice: they open their ears only to listen to nauseous meanness and to pompous eulogium: it is so charming, so agreeable, to be gratified daily with hearing the titles of, “*My Lord*,” and “*Your Excellency!*” It is so cruel to deprive oneself of this enjoyment, which is found inscribed in the nomenclature of the vanities of this world! A minister really worthy of the eminent post which he occupies ought to adopt this device: *for myself nothing, —for you every thing.*

If our ministers are virtuous men, they will prove it in *tendering their resignation*: by a conduct so noble, so delicate, they will carry with them into the second rank, or into retirement, the esteem of their fellow citizens; who will see in them honest ministers, to whom they cannot impute the continued succession of our misfortunes, because they could not do better. The example of the ministry of 1815 is recent: it is the attribute of great minds to imitate excellent models.

The royalist, the republican, the imperialist, the liberals, every class of citizens, complains of the present administration. If our ministers brave the public clamour, we shall see no more

in them than proud spirits, who sacrifice to a vain and ridiculous amour propre, *the happiness of twenty-seven millions of Frenchmen, who, like themselves, are children of the same country.*

If one places in the balance the personal interest of four or five individuals, to-day seated upon the pinnacle, yesterday amongst the crowd, and the general interests of twenty-seven millions of people, one will discover without hesitation, that there is no equipoise. If our ministers are deaf to the counsels of that *secret voice*, in the name of humanity, in the sacred name of our country, I conjure them to renounce their false system of tactics which have poured with profusion every calamity on unhappy France. If they do not consent to place themselves in our hands as their guardians, and even their trustees, will you, representatives of the French nation, suffer them to declare themselves our *guardians* and our *trustees*, when experience incontestably proves that they may receive wise counsels *from their wards*; that they ought to profit by the useful lessons of *those whose mouths they wish to stop*.

The ministry, establishing false principles, bestows an honorary title on the false consequences which conduct to such deplorable results: it gives us an extraordinary representation on the grand theatre of public affairs of a country at its last gasp. Will you, gentlemen, who could partake with them of the honour of the scene by changing the denouement of the drama; will you, as secondary actors, confine yourselves to the parts of the danccrs in the ballet, contenting yourselves with making a parade, and fixing attention, by amusing the public, who could not laugh at your tricks? When France is in tears, wrangling, complaisance, in a word, legislative farces, are out of season. No, there must be a hearty reunion, a common accord.

The French ministry have committed weighty faults in not putting a stop to the exportation of grain and of flour; in not

opposing certain importations ; in not directing the power of the real national spirit for the interest of the state, the interest of the monarch, against the introduction and extension of foreign influence in our interior and exterior affairs. Nothing is seen every where but the commander-in-chief of the allied armies, *who being invested with no diplomatic character*, is nothing, absolutely nothing, at Paris, since the British power is represented by an ambassador, who appears to rest in oblivion.

Are we at peace ? Are we at war ? We are at peace in virtue of a treaty ; we must pay a stipulated sum of contributions ; our territory is occupied by foreign troops as a pledge for the debt. However unlawful the debt may be, we have acknowledged it, we are paying it. For the rest we are independent, or we have a right to make ourselves regarded as such. We are free to govern ourselves as wisdom shall I suggest to our government ?

They say it is under British influence, that the last system of finance has been presented to the chamber. They say it is under British influence that the ministers have insinuated to you that you must adopt it.—It is but the *ipse dixit* of popular rumour it is true : if I had assurance of it, this incertitude would open a new career, which would earnestly pervade my zeal, my boldness, my love for my country, my devotion to the sacred cause of humanity.

Shall we again believe this *ipse dixit* ? the ministers reply. *England has wished it.* For myself I answer the ministers, *France does not wish it.* The French, always Frenchmen, are ready to drive away the English. Should we fear Europe conspiring against us ?

“ L'Europe s'aperçoit que le rideau des mers,

“ Pour elle chez Vulcain dija se change in fers.”

“Europe perceives the trident of the sea,
“E'en now by Vulcan changed into her chains.”

England can arrogate no right without violating (as it is wont) the faith of treaties. Our ministers in suffering this usurpation on our rights, forget that they are the natural defenders of the throne and of the national honour.

France is not and cannot be *the fourth kingdom united to the three kingdoms*; being their ally, I consent to. France recognizes no authority but that of her king: she refuses to bend her neck under the yoke of a *proconsul*. The establishment of a *proconsulate* is not stipulated in the treaty of Paris; Russia, Austria, Prussia, have not recognized it. France only submits to the faith of treaties.

Call to mind, gentlemen, that one of the organs of the ministry has told you, in this tribune, 15th November, 1816, “The nation which gained so much glory in the career of arms, is not formed to *languish humiliated* in that of adversity.

“No, unhappy France will prove that she is still France; and that, in spite of her reverses, she has a right to preserve her reputation as a *noble and courageous nation*.” Could one not retort again on the minister his own arguments, in addressing to him the sense of this verse:

“Ame, par ce seul mot ton devoir est dicté.”

“Friend, in this single word, thy duty's taught.”

The organ of the ministry has added: “The French have shewn themselves worthy of that privilege of a great people (a constitutional government), by their zeal to satisfy every claim that has been hitherto made on them, *by sacrifices, by patience, and by efforts*.

The French actually make a great many *sacrifices*; but reason, equity, and their interest, demand that they should receive somewhat *in exchange*.

They have *patience*; let us beware of exhausting it; let us dread the fatal moment of its exhaustion. Listen to the *cries of the people*.

EFFORTS. France makes them, she will make them for her independence, without eluding the execution of treaties. She loves her king: she cherishes, also, her liberties, the object of her desires. Let us fear, lest she direct her efforts against the ravishers of these rights. Transport yourselves in thought, gentlemen, from the banks of the Tagus to the borders of the Vistula, from the banks of the Wolga to the borders of the Thames; run over the space from the Baltic to the Mediterranean: every where are heard the *cries of the people*. Witnesses of their sighs, of their complaints, of their tears, humanity groans, reason is affrighted, happiness flies away; misfortune and misery, surrounded with their satellites, establish their garrisons.

Yes, gentlemen, it is in the independence, in the prosperity of France, that Europe will find its felicity, its security, its safety. Instead of occupying ourselves with vain and idle discussions, let us undertake a task worthy the zeal of French representatives. Let us, in the face of sovereigns, proclaim the professions of belief of our excellent country; let us tell them:

“Princes,

“The representatives of the august nation of France assemble to repair the misfortunes of their country, misfortunes of which your people experience the re-action.

“France, placed by the pressure of events under the yoke of a military government, bore her standard on the tops of your palaces: she desired peace; but her ambitious leader, in order to gather laurels, electrified his soldiers in offering them the attraction which the love of glory presents to warriors.

“ Europe, governed by the right of conquest, essayed to break its chains. Your people ran to arms, you profited by our distresses, our reverses, and our dissensions; in the midst of your successes, Attila disappeared, *Europe was revenged.*

“ Enlightened by experience, France thought but of procuring itself a solid and durable happiness: if there still remained to her the possibility of conquest, would she have the desire of it? No: she would act against her proper interests.

“ Recovering her independence, she will enjoy in the bosom of tranquillity the advantages which she has received from nature. Her prosperity will re-establish the relations of your subjects, interrupted by the influence which our calamities exercise upon the decrease of the prosperity of other nations.

“ Princes, it remains with you to fulfil a sacred duty, enjoined by the necessities of your people. Withdraw your legions from our territory; set us at liberty from our extraordinary and unlawful charges.

“ By this noble and generous conduct, so conformable to the laws of sound policy, to the desire of humanity: you will refind, with usury, a compensation for your sacrifices in the re-establishment of the political and commercial equilibrium of Europe.

“ In thus acting, Princes, convince yourselves thoroughly of this important truth: *you will do nothing for France, you will do every thing for your subjects;* you will give them proofs of your solicitude; you will shew yourselves their friend, their father, by acquiring claims to their gratitude, new claims to their love.

“ Would the representatives of France stoop to supplicate? No, gentlemen; they will limit themselves to remonstrating.

If the voice of humanity is not heard in the courts of sovereigns, we shall groan, we shall pay, we shall respect treaties, we shall exhibit an example of loyalty.

“We shall re-unite our efforts, our zeal, in order to fulfil our engagements. We shall be prompt to relieve the landed proprietor, the merchant, the manufacturer, the tradesman, the artizan: we shall present a willing band to the unfortunate, and the indigent shall engage our first attention; *we shall do that which has not been yet done.* In ameliorating the lot of our fellow citizens, we shall lay the first foundation of the edifice of public prosperity. If we do not succeed in perfectly consolidating it, our conscience will address no reproaches to our heart, to our intention. We shall wait for fair weather, to finish entirely the edifice, to cover it with a tutelary roof: this blessing we shall enjoy, when we have recovered our independence. At this æra, the horizon will brighten, the clouds will disappear, the sun will shine over the world.

Europe knows the value of a Frenchman; **AMONGST OURSELVES**, we shall be always French. If from the banks of the Elbe to the mouths of the Cattaro, if from the mountains of Castille to the forests of Muscovy, echo has answered to the clattering of our arms, to the sound of our clarions, to the fame of our triumphs, to the movement of our camps, let us substitute the calm of peace. Let us for ever deposit our immortal laurels at the foot of victory; let us close the temple of Janus; let us open the temple of Minerva; on the soil of our country let us cultivate the olive.

If against the rights of people and the law of nations, we were treated as enemies by friends, let us forgive our injuries; religion ordains it, humanity wills it, reason exacts it.

Let us abjure our errors; let us proscribe our prejudices; let us drive away, for ever, the return of those unhappy times, where crime set up his banner; let us not celebrate

the waking up of the people, but let us avoid this terrible alarm.

“ Veillons au salut de l’empire,
“ Veillons au maintien de nos lois.”

“ We watch the empire’s safety,
“ We watch to guard our laws.”

Let us not finish as the revolutionists, and let us not repeat

“ Si le despotesime conspire
“ Conspirons la perte des rois.”

“ If despotism hatches plots,
“ We plot the fall of kings.”

Let us compassionate, let us sincerely compassionate sovereigns; always idolized by sycophants; by a court; always deceived by their ministers; *they are ignorant of the good which they might do, and the evils which they should avoid.*

“ Veillons au salut de l’empire,
“ Veillons au maintien de nos lois;
“ Si contre la France on conspire,
“ Jurons de defendre ses droits.”

“ We watch to guard the empire’s safety,
“ We watch to guard our laws;
“ If foreign foes ‘gainst France conspire,
“ ‘Tis we have sworn to guard her rights.”

Representatives, those days of license are passed, during which an inconsiderable portion of mankind, wandering from religious morality, forgetting the laws of nature, oppressed their brethren, their equals: they will return no more.

“ Les tems sont bien changes ; vos maitres et les miens ;
“ Les etats, le senat, tous les vrais citoyen,

“ Ont enfin rappelle la liberte publique ;

“ Nous ne redoutons plus ce pouvoir tyrannique.”

“ The time’s now chang’d ; your masters, ah, and mine,

“ The state, the senate, each tne citizen,

“ At last have called back public liberty ;

“ No more we look with fear on tyrant power.”

Those unlicensed days are passed away in which a handful of democrats enslaved their equals by invoking equality. Those days of horror are no more which gave light to the crimes which these cannibals committed before the idol of licentiousness ; they will return no more : we shall find an assurance of it in your wisdom and your humanity.

Lastly, those days of license are passed, during which the representatives of France, slaves of the head of the state, or of the ministry, were but the instruments of their will ; they will return no more ; we hold as guarantees of it your probity, your honour, your oaths. Representatives of a free people, you will no more be slaves.

Representatives, a new arena is before us : enter it, armed with constancy, with courage, with firmness, and with devotion. If the passions have again arrested you, by keeping you in the dark as to your duties, I would advance alone into this arena : strong in my love for my country, bold in defending the cause of the public weal, I would, in imitation of Serторius, tell you at this tribune,

France is no more in France, she is altogether where I am.

Representatives, I throw down the glove : take it up not in order to combat a good citizen, the friend of his country, of order, of peace, of union, but that it may become amongst you a rallying signal. I give you the impulse, legislative phalanx, pillars of the state : march towards the altar of your country ; renew your oaths, and be faithful to them.

Remember that the great Conde, seeing his soldiers fall back, cast his marshal's staff into the trenches of the enemy: that his soldiers, rallying at the voice of their general, forced the entrenchments. Conde spoke to Frenchmen: you are Frenchmen: success depends on the first impulse,—I give it you: follow me, representatives, follow me.

I have vigorously attacked the government; I have harassed it on its route, in order to open its eyes, perceiving it plunged in an apathy difficult to explain and to conceive. Very far from endeavouring to overturn it, to destroy it, I have pointed out to it the precipice opened under its feet. I have followed the precepts of my religion: *succour thy brother*. I have brought moral science into play. I have executed the laws of natural morality: I have done to another what I would have him do to me, if accidents and destiny, the dispensers of the inequalities amongst men, had raised me to the pinnacle of grandeur. I have acted as an honest man, as the friend of humanity, in expressing my ardent desire for the happiness of twenty-seven millions of men, who are my fellow-citizens, and of more than a hundred and fifty millions of Europeans, who are my equals.

“I’ai consulte les lois, le maitre du tonnerre,

“L’interet de l’etat, l’interet de la terre.”

“The laws, the arm of thunder have I sought,

“The weal of states, the weal of this our earth.”

I have been sincere, very sincere, *behold my crime*; if it is a *crime* to make that truth understood which contrasts itself with baseness, with nauseous adulation, with falsehood, with the stupidity which we read, and which we hear passed off every day. Let the name of religion be no more the instrument of the passions: let us not abuse words or things. The terms of virtue, of probity, of morality, are not destitute

of meaning in my mouth ; I speak without hatred, and without fear : I have a right to do so ; I am *without fear*, because I am *without reproach*

Representatives, I have now accomplished a painful but an honourable task, in pointing out prejudices. Prejudices tend to perpetuate the reign of error. I have followed this maxim of our ancient worthies. *I will do what I ought, let what will come of it.*

It would require that an obscure citizen had received from nature the voice of a Stentor to make himself heard through the mist, formed by the reunion of passions and of private interests which conceal the throne from the sight of the vulgar. I cried in vain, echo gave me no answer. I have declared myself the organ of the nation. I have made *the cries of the people* to be heard ; they have just thundered at your ears. Alone, I cannot alleviate my country. *I have done my duty, let what will come of it.*

In pertinaciously following its blind routine, government refuses to enlighten itself by the evidence of facts : it involuntarily conspires against the state. I deplore its blindness. It conspires against itself. I have warned it of the fact. *I am doing what I ought to do, let what will come of it.*

If I have only spoken to the walls which inclose this circumference ; if my councils are repulsed far from the throne : I will say, *May my country be happy,—I have done my duty, let what will come of it.* **EVERY THING IS GOING ON BADLY :** *I have done my duty ; Ministers, Magistrates, Representatives, do yours, EVERY THING WILL GO ON WELL.*

NOTES.

(a) There have been published for two years, and principally during the session of 1816, works on the administration and the finances, which comprise wise views, and useful councils. They may have been read by a small number of the representatives, and perhaps they have not been read by any of them either because the purchase would have occasioned too heavy an expense, or because they were unaware of such works existing ; for the journals do not publish an account of all works, for reasons which the police knows better than myself. If the representatives had at their disposition all the writings worthy of attention, they could meditate on them. An idea that they might draw from an author, would give birth to another in their mind : from a comparison of the views published by writers, there would result new ideas and views, which, emanating with the representatives, and discussed in the secret committees, would lead to ameliorations of high interest. Would it not be essential, even indispensable, that the Chamber of Representatives made a choice of the publications, and that a copy should be distributed to each of its members, at the cost of the Chamber ? This distribution would require an expense of twenty or thirty thousand francs, which would be well compensated by the advantages which would result from it. I could desire that the funds arising from the taxes were never worse employed.

This recommendation is not that of an author interested in this measure. I beg credit for only offering this idea with a view to the general interest. It is known that authors who contribute by the sacrifice of their time, have not all sufficient pecuniary resources to enable them gratuitously to distribute two hundred and fifty copies of their works,

a distribution which would entail a loss on them of five hundred, a thousand, fifteen hundred, or probably more francs.

(b) I last year presented in my Political Essay upon the important Art of governing a State, the theory of a nominal *currency*, as a matter the most important which could be treated of in finance, as it is this theory which replies to this question. *How is it that France, possessing a considerable national capital, and enormous territorial riches, pays, and always has paid with so much difficulty, an amount of public charges so disproportionate to the extent of her resources and her revenue?*

I naturally concluded that this theory would fix the attention of Government, and that of the Chamber of Representatives; I have been deceived in my expectation: I could have wished that they might demonstrate the falsehood of it to me, if they had judged it such; but I presume that it has not been thought upon. Will they tell me that it is so absurd as to be unworthy of examination? I will reply, that some persons of information have not held the same opinion on it, and that others have approved it.

When our wounds are yearly opening, is it not the duty of administration, and of men called upon to cicatrise them, to neglect nothing, and in their wisdom, aided by their information, to weigh the views and the means of amelioration and of cure which writers present?

Such is, such always has been, the carelessness of administration, that all the plans which require reflexion in their application, are suffered to rest in oblivion. Experience often instructs us that useful views, wise reflexions, addressed to government, have been judged capable of offering important advantages in their execution, and that by the effect of laziness, indolence, or wounded self-sufficiency, they remain condemned to superannuation in the rusty archives of ministers: so true is it that the administration is directed by a spirit of routine. *They decide with difficulty on doing good: evil alone is easily done.*

The ideas of salutary innovation and amelioration are rarely even conceived by a public functionary, who, according to his usual habits, remains in the petty frame which is chalked out for him, and whose

short sightedness, or want of preliminary information, retains him in the confined circle traced by the spirit of routine.

My theory is one of such high importance, that I cannot too strongly recommend the examination of it, and reflexion upon it, to the representatives of 1817, saving rejection or refutation. Let a writer publicly refute me, I shall be satisfied. If his refutation destroys my reasonings, I shall confess myself conquered, and shall not be ashamed of my defeat, since writing for the interest of my country, I have put force on myself to attain a useful end.

I await impatiently a refutation of a theory altogether new, the adoption of which would infallibly exercise the most active influence on the public prosperity. A government, in critical times, ought to neglect nothing: it ought to see every thing, to examine every thing; it cannot release itself from fulfilling this sacred duty. *Let any one who is able, refute me.*

